

LOW REGULARITY SOLUTIONS FOR THE KADOMTSEV-PETVIASHVILI I EQUATION

J. COLLIANDER, C. KENIG, AND G. STAFFILANI

ABSTRACT. In this paper we obtain local in time existence and (suitable) uniqueness and continuous dependence for the KP-I equation for small data in the intersection of the energy space and a natural weighted L^2 space.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider the KP initial value problem (IVP)

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t u + \partial_x^3 u + \gamma \partial_x^{-1} \partial_y^2 u + \beta \partial_x(u^2) = 0, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x) \end{cases} \quad (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2, t \in \mathbb{R},$$

where $u = u(t, x, y)$ is a scalar unknown function, $\beta \neq 0$ and $\gamma \neq 0$ are real constant. If $\gamma < 0$ the IVP (1.1) is called KP-I and if $\gamma > 0$ it takes the name KP-II. These equations model [12] the propagation along the x -axis of nonlinear dispersive long waves on the surface of a fluid with a slow variation along the y -axis. They also arise as universal models in wave propagation and may be considered as two dimensional generalizations of the Korteweg-de Vries equation.

The first result regarding well-posedness for a KP type equation is due to Ukai [29]. He uses a standard energy method that does not recognize the type I or II of the equation. His result provides local well-posedness for initial data and their antiderivatives in H^s , $s \geq 3$. Faminskii [6] observed a better smoothing effect in the KP-II evolution and used this to prove well-posedness results. Bourgain performed a Fourier analysis [3] of the term $\partial_x(u^2)$ in the KP-II equation in which the derivative is recovered in a nonlinear way. The result obtained gave local well-posedness of KP-II for initial data in L^2 . Since the L^2 norm is conserved during the KP-II evolution, the L^2 local result may be iterated to prove global well-posedness. Takaoka [26] and Takaoka and Tzvetkov [27] improved Bourgain's result by proving local well-posedness in an anisotropic Sobolev space¹ $H_{x,y}^{-\frac{1}{3}+\epsilon,0}$. For the KP-I equation the situation is more delicate. There are several results on local and global existence of solutions, but not a satisfactory well-posedness theory for data with no more than two derivatives in L^2 . Fokas and Sung [7], and Zhou [30], obtained global existence for small data via inverse scattering techniques. Schwarz [25] proved existence of weak global periodic solutions with small L^2 data. The smallness condition was subsequently removed [4]. Tom [28] proved existence of global weak solutions for initial data in H^1

J.E.C. was supported in part by N.S.F. Grant DMS 0100595 and N.S.E.R.C. Grant RGPIN 250233-03.

C.K. was supported in part by N.S.F Grant DMS 9500725.

G.S. was supported in part by N.S.F. Grant DMS 0100375 and a grant by the Sloan Foundation.

¹Here $H_{x,y}^{s_1,s_2} = \{f \in \mathcal{S}' : \int \int |\langle \xi \rangle^{s_1} \langle \mu \rangle^{s_2} \widehat{f}(\xi, \mu)|^2 d\xi d\mu < \infty\}$ where $\langle \cdot \rangle = (1 + |\cdot|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\widehat{\cdot}$ denotes the Fourier transform from the spatial variables (x, y) to their dual variables (ξ, μ) .

together with their antiderivative. For well-posedness results, we recall the work of Saut [23], Isaza, Mejía and Stallbohm [10] and finally the work of Iório and Nunes [9]. The last two authors use the quasi linear theory of Kato, together with parabolic regularization, to prove local well-posedness with data and their antiderivatives in H^s , $s > 2$. The limitation $s > 2$ is needed in order to insure that $\partial_x u \in L^\infty$, an essential assumption for the proof. Molinet, Saut and Tzvetkov [22] also proved that if one is willing to assume more regularity for the initial data (at least three derivatives in the x variable and two in the y variable need to be in L^2), then global well-posedness holds. Recently we [5] were able to obtain well-posedness for small data in a weighted Sobolev space with essentially H^2 regularity, we will return to this result later.

We recall a few known facts associated with the KP equations. If one defines the Fourier transform for a function $f(x, y)$ as

$$\hat{f}(\xi, \mu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} f(x, y) e^{-i(x\xi + y\mu)} dx dy,$$

then it is easy to see that the dispersive function associated to this equation is

$$(1.2) \quad \omega(\xi, \mu) = \xi^3 - \gamma \frac{\mu^2}{\xi}.$$

The analysis of the KP initial value problem depends crucially on the *sign* of γ . We describe *three differences* due to the choice of sign: the strength of the smoothing effect, the bilinear dispersive identity and (non)positivity of the top order terms in the energy.

A first example of the relevance of the sign of γ comes from the following observation. If we compute the gradient of ω , we have that for KP-I ($\gamma = -1$, for example)

$$(1.3) \quad |\nabla \omega(\xi, \mu)| = |(3\xi^2 - \frac{\mu^2}{\xi^2}, 2\frac{\mu}{\xi})| \geq |\xi|,$$

and for KP-II ($\gamma = 1$, for example)

$$(1.4) \quad |\nabla \omega(\xi, \mu)| = |(3\xi^2 + \frac{\mu^2}{\xi^2}, -2\frac{\mu}{\xi})| \geq |\xi|^2.$$

Then, following the argument of Kenig, Ponce and Vega in [14], we can claim that thanks to (1.4) KP-II recovers a full derivative smoothness along the x direction, while by (1.3) KP-I recovers only $\frac{1}{2}$ derivative smoothness along that same direction. Because the nonlinear term in (1.1) presents a derivative along the x direction, this explains, at least formally, why well-posedness questions for the KP-I IVP are much more difficult to answer than for the KP-II problem.

The “sign problem” illustrated above appears also if one approaches well-posedness questions using the method presented by Bourgain in [3]. This method is based on the strength of various denominators which are controlled using the bilinear dispersive identity

$$(1.5) \quad \begin{aligned} & \omega(\xi_1 + \xi_2, \mu_1 + \mu_2) - \omega(\xi_1, \mu_1) - \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2) \\ &= \frac{\xi_1 \xi_2}{(\xi_1 + \xi_2)} \left(3(\xi_1 + \xi_2)^2 + \gamma \left(\frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} - \frac{\mu_2}{\xi_2} \right)^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly if $\gamma < 0$ (KP-I) this quantity could be zero, while if $\gamma > 0$ (KP-II)

$$|\omega(\xi_1 + \xi_2, \mu_1 + \mu_2) - \omega(\xi_1, \mu_1) - \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2)| \geq C|\xi_1||\xi_2||\xi_1 + \xi_2|.$$

This is enough to control the derivative in the nonlinear term and to obtain well-posedness results for very rough data (see also Takaoka [26], Takaoka-Tzvetkov [27]).

The IVP (1.1) has two conserved integrals, the L^2 -norm and the Hamiltonian:

$$(1.6) \quad \|u\|_{L^2} = \|u_0\|_{L^2}$$

$$(1.7) \quad H(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} ((\partial_x u)^2 - \gamma(\partial_x^{-1} \partial_y u)^2 - \frac{\beta}{3} u^3) dx dy = H(u_0).$$

This time, for KP-I, the sign is favorable. In fact one can prove ² that a combination of (1.6) with (1.7) when $\gamma = -1$, gives

$$(1.8) \quad \|u(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x u(t)\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x^{-1} \partial_y u(t)\|_{L^2} \leq C (\|u_0\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x u_0\|_{L^2} + \|\partial_x^{-1} \partial_y u_0\|_{L^2}),$$

for any sufficiently smooth solution u , uniformly in time. The Sobolev space defined by (1.8) is naturally called the *energy space*. It is the natural space on which the Hamiltonian is defined, and thus it would be desirable to obtain a local well-posedness theory for KP-I in this space. (As we mentioned before, Tom [28] proved the existence of global weak solutions, for data in the energy space, using (1.8) and compactness arguments, but the uniqueness of these weak solutions remains an open problem). Moreover, if one could also prove that the time T of existence in this (desired) local existence theorem depends only on the norms involved in (1.8), then a simple iteration argument, combined with (1.8), would yield global in time solutions for data in the energy space, and hence the Hamiltonian would be defined globally in time, for the natural space of initial data, providing a satisfactory “low-regularity” space in which KP-I is globally well-posed, and in which the Hamiltonian is naturally defined. We next remark that this desired dependence on T above is validated by scaling considerations. In fact, if we fix $|\beta| = 1, \gamma = -1$ and $u(x, y, t)$ is a solution of (1.1), then $u_\lambda(x, y, t) = \lambda^2 u(\lambda x, \lambda^2 y, \lambda^3 t)$ is also a solution of (1.1), with initial data $u_{\lambda,0}(x, y) = \lambda^2 u_0(\lambda x, \lambda^2 y)$. Note that $\|u_{\lambda,0}\|_{L^2} = \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \|u_0\|_{L^2}$, $\|\partial_x u_{\lambda,0}\|_{L^2} = \lambda^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\partial_x u_0\|_{L^2}$, $\|\partial_x^{-1} \partial_y u_{\lambda,0}\|_{L^2} = \lambda^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\partial_x^{-1} \partial_y u_0\|_{L^2}$, so that (1.1) is “sub-critical” in the energy space and thus one expects the time of existence in a local well-posedness theorem, as the one discussed before, to depend only on the norm of the initial data in the energy space. (See also Remark 4.1 for further discussion of the notion of “criticality”). Note also that if one is only interested in global existence of solutions of KP-I, with fairly regular initial data, the recent work [22] provides a very satisfactory global existence theory, by combining the local well-posedness results of Iorio and Nunes [9], mentioned before, with higher order conservation laws for KP-I (suitably regularized by the use of Strichartz inequalities).

In the attempt to establish a local well-posedness theory for KP-I in the energy space, one is confronted by the following difficulty, which we have not been able to overcome: so far, in the many studies of local well-posedness for nonlinear dispersive equations, the only successful approach to the issue of “low regularity” data has been through the use of fixed point theorems based on Picard iteration. However, the recent counterexamples of Molinet, Saut and Tzvetkov [21], [22], show that, for KP-I, we cannot prove local well-posedness in any type of anisotropic L^2 -based Sobolev space $H_{x,y}^{s_1,s_2}$, or in the energy space, by using Picard fixed point methods for the integral equation formulation of the KP-I initial value problem. In light of this, to study the local well-posedness theory in the

²See for example [4].

energy space, one must abandon Picard iteration, and proceed in a new way. Since weak solutions have been constructed in [28], as we mentioned before, the key issue is uniqueness and one needs to establish this without relying on the classical Gronwall inequality, which seems to require too much regularity on the data. Possibly, recent works of Molinet and Ribaud on dissipative generalizations of KP [19] and KdV [20] may prove useful in this direction, but we have not been able to establish the required uniqueness.

Given this unsatisfactory state of affairs, an alternative is to use spaces other than $H_{x,y}^{s_1,s_2}$, or the energy space, but with similar regularity properties, and for which Picard iteration might still work. For example, in our recent work [5], we addressed the well-posedness question for KP-I, by restricting the space of initial data, which we took to consist (essentially) of functions, which together with two derivatives, belonged to the weighted space $L^2((1+|y|)^\alpha dx dy)$, $\alpha > \frac{1}{2}$, and have small norm. Our proof relied on the so called “oscillatory integrals” method, which combines local smoothing effects and maximal function estimates.

Our goal in the present paper is to refine the local well-posedness result mentioned above, to reduce the number of the derivatives needed on the initial data to bring it to a space which is close to the energy space we discussed before. We use versions of the spaces and methods introduced by Bourgain [3], extended to the context of weighted Besov spaces. The weights are used to exploit the fact that the region where (1.5) is small, is a region of small measure. The estimates we present are sharp, in a sense that will be made clear later, and are obtained in Besov-type spaces involving derivatives of order $1 - \epsilon$ and the weight $|y|$. We are able to remove any assumption on the initial data concerning small frequency, but due to the fact that in this case weighted spaces do not rescale well (see Remark 4.1), our well-posedness result again holds only for small data. From now on we will restrict ourselves to $|\beta| = 1$.

Let's now define the energy space E and the weighted space P as

$$(1.9) \quad E = \{f : f \in L^2, \partial_x f \in L^2, \partial_y \partial_x^{-1} f \in L^2\}, \text{ and } P = \{f : yf \in L^2\}.$$

Remark 1.1. We consider the space $E \cap P$ natural in the context of KP-I. It was proved by Saut [23], that for smooth solutions u of KP-I, whose initial data u_0 is in $E \cap P$, then for any fixed time interval $[-T, T]$, u enjoys the a priori bound

$$\|u\|_{L_{[-T,T]}^\infty(E \cap P)} \leq C(T, \|u_0\|_{E \cap P}).$$

Let us denote now by B_ρ the ball in $E \cap P$, centered at zero, and radius ρ . To state the main theorem we will also need the spaces $(E \cap P)_{1-\epsilon}$, and $Z_{1-\epsilon}$. The first space will be defined in (1.12), but for now, all the reader needs to know about it is that it roughly has ϵ fewer derivatives than the space $E \cap P$. The space $Z_{1-\epsilon}$ is introduced in (1.17). It is a Bourgain type space (following the spaces introduced in [3]), in which the contraction mapping theorem is applied.

Theorem 1. *Assume that $\gamma = -1$ in (1.1) and fix an interval of time $[0, T]$, and a small $\epsilon > 0$. Then, there exists $\delta > 0$, $\delta = \delta(\epsilon, T)$ such that for any $u_0 \in E \cap P$ with $\|u_0\|_{E \cap P} < \delta$, there exists a unique solution*

$$u \in L^\infty([0, T]; E \cap P) \cap C([0, T]; (E \cap P)_{1-\epsilon}) \cap Z_{1-\epsilon}$$

with $\|u\|_{Z_{1-\epsilon}} \leq C\delta$. Moreover, the map that associates the initial data in $E \cap P$ to the solution u is smooth from the ball B_δ into the space $C([0, T]; (E \cap P)_{1-\epsilon})$.

This theorem is a consequence of a well-posedness result involving the Besov type spaces of initial data mentioned earlier, (see Theorem 2 below). We start by giving a precise definition for these spaces.

Definition 1. Let $\theta_0(s) = \chi_{[-1,1]}(s)$, $\theta_m(s) = \chi_{[2^{m-1}, 2^m]}(|s|)$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$. For $(\xi, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ let $\chi_1(\xi, \mu) = \chi_{\{|\xi| \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}\}}$, and $\chi_2(\xi, \mu) = \chi_{\{|\xi| < \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}\}}$. We define the space $B_s^{2,1}$ of functions on $\mathbb{R}^2$ as the closure of the Schwartz functions, for which the norm below is finite, with respect to

$$(1.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \|f\|_{B_s^{2,1}} &= \sum_{m \geq 0} \|(1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^s \theta_m(\xi) \chi_1(\xi, \mu) \hat{f}(\xi, \mu)\|_{L^2} \\ &+ \sum_{n \geq 0} \|(1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^s \theta_n(\mu) \chi_2(\xi, \mu) \hat{f}(\xi, \mu)\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

We also define a “weighted Besov space”, $P_r^{2,1}$ using the norm

$$(1.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \|f\|_{P_r^{2,1}} &= \sum_{m \geq 0} \|(1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^r \theta_m(\xi) \chi_1(\xi, \mu) \partial_\mu \hat{f}(\xi, \mu)\|_{L^2} \\ &+ \sum_{n \geq 0} \|(1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^r \theta_n(\mu) \chi_2(\xi, \mu) \partial_\mu \hat{f}(\xi, \mu)\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 1.2. Going back to the discussion of the smoothing effect involving (1.3) and (1.4), one can see that the splitting into the two regions $R_g = \{|\xi| \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}\}$ and $R_b = \{|\xi| < \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}\}$ is quite natural. In fact in the “good” region R_g it’s easy to check that $|\nabla \omega(\xi, \mu)| \gtrsim |\xi|^2$, hence here one should expect a gain of a full derivative. On the other hand in the “bad” region R_b one has $|\nabla \omega(\xi, \mu)| \gtrsim |\xi|$, and the gain should be only of half derivative, (see also Proposition 5).

Remark 1.3. Because $l^1 \subset l^2$, it follows that $B_1^{2,1} \cap P_0^{2,1} \subseteq E \cap P$. Moreover, if $\epsilon > 0$, then we also have $E \cap P \subseteq B_{1-\epsilon}^{2,1} \cap P_{-\epsilon}^{2,1}$. To see this, first assume that $f \in E$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{m \geq 0} \|(1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^{1-\epsilon} \theta_m(\xi) \chi_1(\xi, \mu) \hat{f}(\xi, \mu)\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{m \geq 0} \|2^{-m\epsilon} (1 + |\xi|)^\epsilon (1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^{1-\epsilon} \theta_m(\xi) \chi_1 \hat{f}\|_{L^2} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{m \geq 0} 2^{-m\epsilon} \|(1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}) \theta_m(\xi) \chi_1 \hat{f}\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and Cauchy Schwarz concludes this part. On the other hand

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{n \geq 0} \|(1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^{1-\epsilon} \theta_n(\mu) \chi_2(\xi, \mu) \hat{f}(\xi, \mu)\|_{L^2} \\
& \lesssim \sum_{n \geq 0} \left\| \frac{(|\xi| \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^{\frac{1}{2}\epsilon}}{(|\xi| \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^{\frac{1}{2}\epsilon}} (1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^{1-\epsilon} \theta_n(\mu) \chi_2(\xi, \mu) \hat{f}(\xi, \mu) \right\|_{L^2} \\
& \lesssim \sum_{n \geq 0} 2^{-\frac{n}{2}\epsilon} \|(|\xi|^\epsilon + (\frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^\epsilon) (1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^{1-\epsilon} \theta_n(\mu) \chi_2(\xi, \mu) \hat{f}(\xi, \mu)\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

and again Cauchy-Schwarz takes care of this term. Now assume that $f \in P$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{m \geq 0} \|(1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^{-\epsilon} \theta_m(\xi) \chi_1(\xi, \mu) \partial_\mu \hat{f}(\xi, \mu)\|_{L^2} \\
& \lesssim \sum_{m \geq 0} 2^{-m\epsilon} \|\theta_m(\xi) \chi_1(\xi, \mu) \partial_\mu \hat{f}(\xi, \mu)\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

and we use Cauchy-Schwarz. Finally, because $(1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}) \geq 1 + (|\xi| \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^{\frac{1}{2}}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{n \geq 0} \|(1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^{-\epsilon} \theta_n(\mu) \chi_2(\xi, \mu) \partial_\mu \hat{f}(\xi, \mu)\|_{L^2} \\
& \lesssim \sum_{n \geq 0} 2^{-\frac{n}{2}\epsilon} \|\theta_n(\mu) \chi_2(\xi, \mu) \partial_\mu \hat{f}(\xi, \mu)\|_{L^2},
\end{aligned}$$

and also this term is estimated. We are now ready to define the space $(E \cap P)_{1-\epsilon}$, introduced in the statement of Theorem 1, by setting

$$(1.12) \quad (E \cap P)_{1-\epsilon} = B_{1-\epsilon}^{2,1} \cap P_{-\epsilon}^{2,1},$$

for any $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$.

Remark 1.4. If one could prove well-posedness with initial data in $B_{1-\epsilon}^{2,1} \cap P_{-\epsilon}^{2,1}$, on $[-T, T]$, with T depending only on the norm of the initial data in this space, for some $\epsilon > 0$, then for data $u_0 \in E \cap P$ we would obtain, in light of Remarks 1.3 and 1.1, a unique global solution in $C([-T, T], B_{1-\epsilon}^{2,1} \cap P_{-\epsilon}^{2,1}) \cap L^\infty([-T, T], E \cap P)$, for each T , which would depend continuously on the initial data, in the $B_{1-\epsilon}^{2,1} \cap P_{-\epsilon}^{2,1}$ topology. However, as we will explain in Remark 4.1, we show the required local well-posedness only for small data in $B_{1-\epsilon}^{2,1} \cap P_{-\epsilon}^{2,1}$, and our estimates barely miss giving the global result³.

Remark 1.5. If in the definition of $B_s^{2,1}$, the constant $\frac{1}{2}$ appearing in χ_1 and χ_2 is replaced by C , we obtain the same space, with comparable norms. This holds also for $P_r^{2,1}$. Assume that $f \in B_s^{2,1}$ and $0 < C < \frac{1}{2}$. We need to show that

$$(1.13) \quad \sum_{m \geq 0} \|(1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^s \theta_m(\xi) \chi_{\{C \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|} < |\xi| < \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}\}}(\xi, \mu) \hat{f}(\xi, \mu)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|f\|_{B_s^{2,1}}.$$

³Unfortunately though, our estimates are sharp as is shown in Proposition 7.

But if $C\frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|} < |\xi| < \frac{1}{2}\frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}$, then $C|\mu| < |\xi|^2 < \frac{1}{2}|\mu|$. If $m = 0$, then $|\xi|^2 \leq 1$ and $|\mu| \leq C^{-1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \|(1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^s \theta_0(\xi) \chi_{\{C\frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|} < |\xi| < \frac{1}{2}\frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}\}}(\xi, \mu) \hat{f}(\xi, \mu)\|_{L^2} \\ & \lesssim \|(1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^s \chi_{\{|\mu| \leq C^{-1}\}} \chi_{\{|\xi| < \frac{1}{2}\frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}\}}(\xi, \mu) \hat{f}(\xi, \mu)\|_{L^2} \\ & \lesssim C \sum_{n \geq 0} \|(1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^s \theta_n(\mu) \chi_2(\xi, \mu) \hat{f}(\xi, \mu)\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

If $m \geq 1$, $2^{2m-1} \leq |\mu| \leq 2^{2m}/C$. Let n_0 be the smallest integer such that $2^{n_0} \geq 2^{2m}/C$. Then $n_0 \leq 2m + C_0$, $C_0 = C_0(C)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m \geq 1} \|(1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^s \theta_m(\xi) \chi_{\{C\frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|} < |\xi| < \frac{1}{2}\frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}\}}(\xi, \mu) \hat{f}(\xi, \mu)\|_{L^2} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{m \geq 1} \sum_{2m-1 \leq n_0 \leq 2m+C_0} \|(1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^s \theta_{n_0}(\mu) \chi_2(\xi, \mu) \hat{f}(\xi, \mu)\|_{L^2} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{n_0 \geq 1} \|(1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^s \theta_{n_0}(\mu) \chi_2(\xi, \mu) \hat{f}(\xi, \mu)\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and (1.13) follows. We also need to show that

$$(1.14) \quad \sum_{n \geq 0} \|(1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^s \theta_n(\mu) \chi_{\{C\frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|} < |\xi| < \frac{1}{2}\frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}\}}(\xi, \mu) \hat{f}(\xi, \mu)\|_{L^2} \lesssim \|f\|_{B_s^{2,1}}$$

and the argument is similar since

$$2^n \leq |\mu| \leq 2^{n+1} \implies C^{\frac{1}{2}} 2^{\frac{n}{2}} \leq |\xi| \leq (\frac{1}{2})^{\frac{1}{2}} 2^{n/2+1}.$$

The case $C > 1/2$ is proved in the same way, reversing the role of C and $1/2$. A similar proof can be given for the space $P_r^{2,1}$. This remark will be used implicitly in our proofs.

We are now ready to introduce the Banach spaces in which we will perform a fixed point argument to obtain the solution for (1.1). Below, we use $\hat{f}$ to denote the Fourier transform of a function of (x, y, t) , defined in a similar fashion as for functions of (x, y) . We hope that this will not cause confusion to the reader.

Definition 2. Let $\chi_0(s) = \chi_{\{|s| < 1\}}(s)$, $\chi_j(s) = \chi_{\{2^{j-1} \leq |s| < 2^j\}}(s)$, $\omega(\xi, \mu) = \xi^3 + \mu^2/\xi$ and $w(\xi, \mu) = (1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})$. We define the space $X_{s,b}$ through the following norm:

$$\begin{aligned} (1.15) \quad \|f\|_{X_{s,b}} &= \sum_{j,m \geq 0} 2^{jb} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \chi_j(\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)) \chi_1(\xi, \mu) \theta_m(\xi) w^{2s} |\hat{f}|^2(\xi, \mu, \tau) d\xi d\mu d\tau \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &+ \sum_{j,m \geq 0} 2^{jb} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \chi_j(\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)) \chi_2(\xi, \mu) \theta_n(\mu) w^{2s} |\hat{f}|^2(\xi, \mu, \tau) d\xi d\mu d\tau \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

We also define the space

$$(1.16) \quad Y_{s,r,b} = \{f : tf \in X_{s,b}, \text{ and } yf \in X_{r,b}\},$$

and the spaces

$$(1.17) \quad Z_{s,b} = X_{s,b} \cap Y_{s,s-1,b}, \quad Z_{1-\epsilon} = Z_{1-\epsilon, \frac{1}{2}}.$$

Remark 1.6. A statement similar to Remark 1.5 holds for these spaces.

We are now ready to state the well-posedness result for initial data in Besov spaces introduced above.

Theorem 2. *Assume that $\gamma = -1$ in (1.1). For any $\epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{16}$ and for any interval of time $[0, T]$, there exists $\delta = \delta(\epsilon_0, T) > 0$ such that for any $u_0 \in B_{1-\epsilon_0}^{2,1} \cap P_{-\epsilon_0}^{2,1}$ and $\|u_0\|_{B_{1-\epsilon_0}^{2,1} \cap P_{-\epsilon_0}^{2,1}} \leq \delta$, there exists a unique solution u for (1.1) in $Z_{1-\epsilon_0}$. Moreover $u \in B_{1-\epsilon_0}^{2,1} \cap P_{-\epsilon_0}^{2,1}$ and smoothness with respect to initial data holds in the appropriate topology.*

From now on we assume that $\gamma = -1$. In the rest of the paper we often use the notation $A \lesssim B$ if there exists $C > 0$ such that $A \leq CB$, and $A \sim B$ if $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$ with possibly different C 's.

The paper is organized in the following way. In Section 2, we introduce some estimates for the solution of the linear KP-I initial value problem. In Section 3, we present two bilinear estimates (see Theorems 3 and 4 below) that are the heart of the matter for the proof of Theorem 2. The section concludes with a counterexample showing the optimality of our analysis. We finish with Section 4, in which we briefly present the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2. Section 4 also contains a scaling argument which reveals that the optimal analysis in Section 3 is “endpoint critical”.

Acknowledgment. The authors are very grateful to the referees for their extremely careful reading of the manuscript, and their many suggestions, that have greatly clarified our original version of the paper.

2. THE LINEAR ESTIMATES

Consider the linear IVP

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{cases} \partial_t u + \partial_x^3 u - \partial_x^{-1} \partial_y^2 u = 0, \\ u(x, 0) = u_0(x) \end{cases} \quad (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2, t \in \mathbb{R},$$

and let $S(t)u_0$ be the solution. By taking the Fourier transform of the first equation in (2.1) and solving the ODE one can easily see that

$$S(t)u_0(x, y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{i(t\omega(\xi, \mu) + x\xi + y\mu)} \widehat{u_0}(\xi, \mu) d\xi d\mu.$$

We now show that the space $X_{s, \frac{1}{2}} \cap Y_{s, s-1, \frac{1}{2}}$ is well behaved with respect to the group operator $S(t)$.

Proposition 1. (*linear homogeneous estimates*) Assume $\psi \in C_0^\infty(|t| \leq 1)$, $\psi = 1$ on $|t| < \frac{1}{2}$. Then

$$(2.2) \quad \|\psi(t)S(t)u_0\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{B_s^{2,1}},$$

$$(2.3) \quad \|\psi(t)S(t)u_0\|_{Y_{s,s-1,\frac{1}{2}}} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{P_{s-1}^{2,1}} + \|u_0\|_{B_s^{2,1}}.$$

Proof. The proof follows the same arguments used in [16]. We observe that

$$(2.4) \quad (\psi(t)S(t)u_0)^\wedge(\xi, \mu, \tau) = \hat{\psi}(\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu))\widehat{u_0}(\xi, \mu).$$

Here $\widehat{}$ denotes the Fourier transform of a function of 3 variables on the left side of (2.4) and also to denote the transform of functions of 1 and 2 variables on the right side. Then to prove (2.2) we need to estimate the two integral expressions:

$$(2.5) \quad \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{\frac{j}{2}} \sum_{m \geq 0} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w(\xi, \mu)^{2s} \chi_1 \theta_m(\xi) \chi_j(\tau - \omega) |\hat{\psi}(\tau - \omega)|^2 |\widehat{u_0}|^2 d\xi d\mu d\tau \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$(2.6) \quad \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{\frac{j}{2}} \sum_{n \geq 0} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} w(\xi, \mu)^{2s} \chi_2 \theta_n(\mu) \chi_j(\tau - \omega) |\hat{\psi}(\tau - \omega)|^2 |\widehat{u_0}|^2 d\xi d\mu d\tau \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $w(\xi, \mu) = (1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})$. We observe that for $j = 0$

$$(2.7) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\hat{\psi}(\lambda)|^2 \chi_j(\lambda) d\lambda \lesssim \|\hat{\psi}\|_{L^\infty}^2$$

and for $j \geq 1$

$$(2.8) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\hat{\psi}(\lambda)|^2 \chi_j(\lambda) d\lambda \lesssim 2^j \frac{1}{(1 + 2^j)^{2N}} \|(1 + |s|)^N \hat{\psi}(s)\|_{L^\infty}^2$$

for any $N \in \mathbb{N}$. When we insert (2.7) and (2.8) in (2.5) we obtain the bound

$$(2.9) \quad \|u_0\|_{B_s^{2,1}} \|\hat{\psi}\|_{L^\infty} + \sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{2^j}{(1 + 2^j)^N} \|u_0\|_{B_s^{2,1}} \|(1 + |s|)^N \hat{\psi}(s)\|_{L^\infty}.$$

It is easy to see that for $N > 1$, $\sum_{j \geq 1} \frac{2^j}{(1 + 2^j)^N} \leq C$, hence (2.2) is proved for (2.5). A similar argument can be used to estimate (2.6).

To estimate (2.3) we first observe that

$$t\psi(t)S(t)u_0 = \tilde{\psi}(t)S(t)u_0,$$

where $\tilde{\psi}(t) = t\psi(t)$. Hence by (2.2)

$$\|t\psi(t)S(t)u_0\|_{X_{s,b}} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{B_s^{2,1}}.$$

We then turn to $y\psi(t)S(t)u_0$. Using the fact that $(yh(y))^\wedge = -i\partial_\mu \hat{h}(\mu)$ and (2.4), it is easy to see that

$$(2.10) \quad F(y\psi(t)S(t)u_0)(\xi, \mu, \tau) = -2\widehat{\tilde{\psi}}(\tau - \omega) \frac{\mu}{\xi} \widehat{u_0}(\xi, \mu) - \hat{\psi}(\tau - \omega) \widehat{y u_0}(\xi, \mu).$$

Then we can use (2.2) to conclude that

$$\|y\psi(t)S(t)u_0\|_{X_{s-1,b}} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{B_s^{2,1}} + \|yu_0\|_{B_{s-1}^{2,1}}.$$

□

There is an inhomogeneous version of Proposition 1.

Proposition 2. (*linear inhomogeneous estimates*) Assume $\psi \in C_0^\infty(|t| \leq 1)$, $\psi = 1$ on $|t| < \frac{1}{2}$. Then,

$$(2.11) \quad \|\psi(t) \int_0^t S(t-t')h(t') dt'\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}} \lesssim \|h\|_{X_{s,-\frac{1}{2}}},$$

$$(2.12) \quad \|\psi(t) \int_0^t S(t-t')h(t') dt'\|_{Y_{s,s-1,\frac{1}{2}}} \lesssim (\|h\|_{X_{s,-\frac{1}{2}}} + \|th\|_{X_{s,-\frac{1}{2}}} + \|yh\|_{X_{s-1,-\frac{1}{2}}}).$$

Also in this case the proof follows closely the arguments used in [16]. We start with the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. (*stability under time cutoff*) There exists $C > 0$ such that for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\|\psi(t)f\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C\|f\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

To prove the lemma we need the auxiliary space $\tilde{X}_{s,b}$ defined as the closure of the functions in S for which the norm below is finite, with respect to the norm

$$\|f\|_{\tilde{X}_{s,b}} = \left(\sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{j2b} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \chi_j(\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)) (1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^{2s} |\hat{f}|^2(\xi, \mu, \tau) d\xi d\mu d\tau \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Notice that while the space $X_{s,b}$ is defined using an l^1 summation with respect to j , the space $\tilde{X}_{s,b}$ is defined using an l^2 summation. We have the following lemma.

Lemma 2.2. For any b such that $0 < b < \frac{1}{2}$ and any $s \in \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$(2.13) \quad \|\psi(t)f\|_{\tilde{X}_{s,b}} \lesssim \|f\|_{\tilde{X}_{s,b}}.$$

For any b such that $\frac{1}{2} < b < 1$ and any $s \in \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$(2.14) \quad \|\psi(t)f\|_{\tilde{X}_{s,b}} \lesssim \|f\|_{\tilde{X}_{s,b}}.$$

Proof. We start by proving (2.13). Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{j2b} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} \chi_j(\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)) w^{2s} |\hat{f}|^2(\xi, \mu, \tau) d\xi d\mu d\tau \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \simeq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^3} (1 + |\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)|)^{2b} w^{2s} |\hat{f}|^2(\xi, \mu, \tau) d\xi d\mu d\tau \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

where $w(\xi, \mu) = (1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})$. Because

$$(\psi(\cdot)f)\gamma(\xi, \mu, \tau) = \hat{f} *_{\tau} (\hat{\psi}(\cdot)),$$

by following the arguments in [16], it is easy to see that the proof reduces to showing that for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$, (with $(D^b f)\gamma(\tau) = |\tau|^b \hat{f}(\tau)$)

$$(2.15) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} |D^b(e^{iat} f(t)\psi(t))|^2 dt \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\hat{f}(l)|^2 (1 + |l - a|)^{2b} dl.$$

We use fractional derivatives (see appendix in [15]) to obtain

$$\|D^b(e^{iat} f(t)\psi(t)) - D^b(e^{iat} f(t))\psi(t) - e^{iat} f(t)D^b(\psi(t))\|_{L^2} \leq \|D^b(e^{iat} f(t))\|_{L^2} \|\psi\|_{L^\infty}.$$

It follows that

$$\|D^b(e^{iat} f(t)\psi(t))\|_{L^2} \leq \|D^b(e^{iat} f(t))\|_{L^2} \|\psi\|_{L^\infty} + \|e^{iat} f(t)\|_{L^{2r}} \|D^b(\psi(t))\|_{L^{2r'}},$$

for $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{r'} = 1$. Because $b < \frac{1}{2}$, if $\frac{1}{r} = 1 - 2b$, by the Sobolev embedding theorem, we can continue with

$$\|D^b(e^{iat} f(t)\psi(t))\|_{L^2} \leq \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\hat{f}(l)|^2 (1 + |l - a|)^{2b} dl \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} (\|\psi\|_{L^\infty} + \|D^b(\psi(t))\|_{L^{2r'}}).$$

To finish observe that

$$\|D^b(\psi(t))\|_{L^{2r'}} < \infty,$$

because $D^b(\psi) \in L^2 \cap L^\infty$.

The proof of (2.14) follows by combining the above arguments with those in Lemma 3.2 of [16]. $\square$

Note that (2.13) also follows from Lemma 2.2 in [8].

Proof of Lemma 2.1. We recall that by real interpolation (see Theorem 5.6.1 in [2]), if A is a Banach space and

$$l_b^q(A) = \{(f_j) : f_j \in A, \left(\sum_{j \geq 0} (2^{jb} \|f_j\|_A)^q \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} < \infty\},$$

then for any $q_i \in [1, \infty]$,

$$(l_{b_0}^{q_0}(A), l_{b_1}^{q_1}(A))_{\theta, q} = l_{b_\theta}^q(A), (b_0 \neq b_1)$$

where $\theta \in [0, 1]$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ and $b_\theta = \theta b_0 + (1 - \theta)b_1$. We then apply this fact to the spaces $\tilde{X}_{s, b_i}$ with $b_0 < \frac{1}{2}$, $b_1 > \frac{1}{2}$, $q = 1$, we use Lemma 2.2 and then we sum with respect to m and n to obtain Lemma 2.1. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 2. We follow the proof of Lemma 3.3 in [16]. We write

$$\psi(t) \int_0^t S(t - t') h(t') dt' = I + II,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \psi(t) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{i(x\xi+y\mu)} \hat{h}(\xi, \mu, \tau) \psi(\tau - \omega) \frac{e^{it\tau} - e^{it\omega}}{\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)} d\xi d\mu d\tau \\ II &= \psi(t) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{i(x\xi+y\mu)} \hat{h}(\xi, \mu, \tau) [1 - \psi(\tau - \omega)] \frac{e^{it\tau} - e^{it\omega}}{\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)} d\xi d\mu d\tau. \end{aligned}$$

By Taylor expansion we can rewrite I as

$$(2.16) \quad I = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{i^k}{k!} t^k \psi(t) \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{i(x\xi+y\mu+t\omega)} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{h}(\xi, \mu, \tau) (\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu))^{k-1} \psi(\tau - \omega) d\tau \right) d\xi d\mu.$$

For $k \geq 1$ let

$$t^k \psi(t) = \psi_k(t),$$

and note that for any $k \geq 1$ and for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$|\widehat{\psi_k}(s)| \leq C,$$

and for $|s| > 1$,

$$(2.17) \quad |\widehat{\psi_k}(s)| \leq C \frac{(1+k)^2}{(1+|s|)^2}.$$

From (2.16) it is easy to see that

$$I = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{i^k}{k!} \psi_k(t) S(t) h_k(x, y),$$

where

$$\widehat{h_k}(\xi, \mu) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{h}(\xi, \mu, \tau) (\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu))^{k-1} \psi(\tau - \omega) d\tau.$$

Then by Proposition 1, in particular (2.9), and (2.17), we obtain

$$\|I\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}}} \lesssim \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{(1+k)^2}{k!} \|h_k\|_{B_s^{2,1}}.$$

On the other hand it is easy to check that

$$\|h_k\|_{B_s^{2,1}} \lesssim \|h\|_{X_{s, -\frac{1}{2}}},$$

which inserted above gives (2.11). We now pass to II . We write $II = II_1 + II_2$, where

$$\begin{aligned} II_1 &= \psi(t) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{i(x\xi+y\mu)} \hat{h}(\xi, \mu, \tau) [1 - \psi(\tau - \omega)] \frac{e^{it\tau}}{\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)} d\xi d\mu d\tau, \\ II_2 &= -\psi(t) \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{i(x\xi+y\mu)} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{h}(\xi, \mu, \tau) [1 - \psi(\tau - \omega)] \frac{e^{it\omega}}{\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)} d\tau d\xi d\mu. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.1

$$\|II_1\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}}} \lesssim \|h\|_{X_{s, -\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 1 we have

$$\|II_2\|_{X_{s, \frac{1}{2}}} \lesssim \|\tilde{h}\|_{B_s^{2,1}},$$

where

$$\hat{\tilde{h}}(\xi, \mu) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} [1 - \psi(\tau - \omega)] \frac{\hat{h}(\xi, \mu, \tau)}{\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)} d\tau.$$

To finish the proof of (2.11) one just needs to observe that

$$\|\tilde{h}\|_{B_s^{2,1}} \lesssim \|h\|_{X_{s,-\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

To prove (2.12) we first observe that by (2.11)

$$\|t\psi(t) \int_0^t S(t-t')h(t')dt'\|_{X_{s,\frac{1}{2}}} \lesssim \|h\|_{X_{s,-\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

We now use (2.10) to write

$$\begin{aligned} & \|y\psi(t) \int_0^t S(t-t')h(t')dt'\|_{X_{s-1,\frac{1}{2}}} \lesssim \|\tilde{\psi}(t) \int_0^t S(t-t')\bar{h}(t')dt'\|_{X_{s-1,\frac{1}{2}}} \\ & + \|\psi(t) \int_0^t S(t-t')t'\bar{h}(t')dt'\|_{X_{s-1,\frac{1}{2}}} + \|\psi(t) \int_0^t S(t-t')yh(t')dt'\|_{X_{s-1,\frac{1}{2}}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\psi}(t) = t\psi(t)$ and $\hat{\tilde{h}}(\xi, \mu) = 2\mu/\xi \hat{h}(\xi, \mu)$. We use again (2.11) and we continue with

$$\|y\psi(t) \int_0^t S(t-t')h(t')dt'\|_{X_{s-1,\frac{1}{2}}} \lesssim \|h\|_{X_{s,-\frac{1}{2}}} + \|th\|_{X_{s,-\frac{1}{2}}} + \|yh\|_{X_{s-1,-\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

This concludes the proof of Proposition 2. $\square$

In this second part of the section we prove some a priori estimates enjoyed by the solution $S(t)u_0$ of the linear problem (2.1). The first estimate we present is of Strichartz type and is due to Ben-Artzi and Saut [1]:

Proposition 3. (*linear homogeneous estimate*) Assume $u_0 \in L^2$, then

$$(2.18) \quad \|S(t)u_0(x, y)\|_{L^4([0,T], L^4(\mathbb{R}^2))} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{L^2}.$$

We would like to use (2.18) to obtain an L^4 estimates for any generic function f , not necessarily a linear solution. This can be done by foliating the space $\mathbb{R}^3$ using dyadic level sets $\Lambda_j = \{(\xi, \mu, \tau)/|\tau - \omega| \sim 2^j\}$.

Proposition 4. Let $\chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) = \chi_j(\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu))$ as in Definition 2. Then, for $\epsilon > 0$, and with $^\vee$ denoting the inverse Fourier transform,

$$(2.19) \quad \|(\chi_j|\hat{f}|)^\vee\|_{L^4} \lesssim 2^{\frac{j}{2}} \|\hat{f}\chi_j\|_{L^2}$$

$$(2.20) \quad \|f\|_{L^4} \lesssim \left(\sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{(1+\epsilon)j} \|\hat{f}\chi_j\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. Set $(\chi_j|\hat{f}|)^\vee(x, y, t) = g_j(x, y, t)$. Then

$$g_j(x, y, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} e^{i(x\xi + y\mu + t\tau)} |\hat{f}| \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) d\xi d\mu d\tau.$$

We now observe that g_j can be written as an integral of linear solutions for (2.1) with appropriate initial data. More precisely, by a simple change of variables one can write

$$\begin{aligned} g_j(x, y, t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} e^{i(x\xi + y\mu + t(\lambda - \omega(\xi, \mu)))} |\hat{f}|(\xi, \mu, \lambda - \omega(\xi, \mu)) \chi_j(\lambda) d\xi d\mu d\lambda \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{it\lambda} \chi_j(\lambda) \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{i(x\xi + y\mu - t\omega(\xi, \mu))} |\hat{f}|(\xi, \mu, \lambda - \omega(\xi, \mu)) d\xi d\mu \right] d\lambda \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{it\lambda} \chi_j(\lambda) S(-t) g_\lambda(x, y) d\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

where $\widehat{g}_\lambda(\xi, \mu) = |\hat{f}|(\xi, \mu, \lambda - \omega(\xi, \mu))$. Then, by (2.18)

$$\|g_j\|_{L^4} \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_j(\lambda) \|S(t) g_\lambda(x, y)\|_{L^4} d\lambda \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_j(\lambda) \|\hat{f}(\xi, \mu, \lambda - \omega(\xi, \mu))\|_{L_{\xi, \mu}^2} d\lambda,$$

and after Cauchy-Schwarz in λ (2.19) is proved. To prove (2.20) we first foliate the function f over the dyadic levels $|\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)| \sim 2^j$, that is we write $f(x, y, t) = \sum_{j \geq 0} f_j$, where

$$f_j(x, y, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} e^{i(x\xi + y\mu + t\tau)} \hat{f} \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) d\xi d\mu d\tau.$$

Then if we proceed as above and we use Minkowski's inequality, we obtain

$$\|f\|_{L^4} \lesssim \sum_{j \geq 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_j(\lambda) \|S(t) f_\lambda(x, y)\|_{L^4} d\lambda \lesssim \sum_{j \geq 0} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \chi_j(\lambda) \|\hat{f}(\xi, \mu, \lambda - \omega(\xi, \mu))\|_{L_{\xi, \mu}^2} d\lambda$$

where $\widehat{f}_\lambda(\xi, \mu) = |\hat{f}|(\xi, \mu, \lambda - \omega(\xi, \mu))$. Using Cauchy-Schwarz, first in λ , and then in j , the proof is concluded. $\square$

We also need a smoothing effect estimate and a matching maximal function estimate. We start by defining the operators P_+ , P_- and P_0 such that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{P_+(f)}(\xi, \mu) &= \hat{f}(\xi, \mu) \chi_{\{|\xi| > \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}\}}, \\ \widehat{P_-(f)}(\xi, \mu) &= \hat{f}(\xi, \mu) \chi_{\{|\xi| < \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}\}}, \\ \widehat{P_0(f)}(\xi, \mu) &= \hat{f}(\xi, \mu) \chi_{\{|\xi| \sim \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}\}}. \end{aligned}$$

We also recall the operator D^s , $s \geq 0$ defined through the Fourier transform as $\widehat{D^s f}(\xi) = |\xi|^s \hat{f}$. We then have the following proposition.

Proposition 5. (*smoothing effect estimates*) For any $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^2)$,

$$(2.21) \quad \|\partial_x S(t) P_\pm u_0\|_{L_x^\infty L_y^2 L_t^2} \leq C \|u_0\|_{L^2},$$

$$(2.22) \quad \|D_x^{\frac{1}{2}} S(t) P_0 u_0\|_{L_y^\infty L_x^2 L_t^2} \leq C \|u_0\|_{L^2}.$$

Proof. The proof follows the argument presented by Kenig, Ponce and Vega in the proof of the one-dimensional KdV smoothing effect in [15]. To prove (2.21) we first define the

regions of integration

$$\begin{aligned} A_+ &= \{|\xi| >> \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}\} \\ A_- &= \{|\xi| << \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we write

$$\partial_x S(t) P_\pm u_0(x, y) = i \int_{A_\pm} e^{i(x\xi + y\mu)} \xi e^{it\omega(\xi, \mu)} \widehat{u}_0(\xi, \mu) d\xi d\mu,$$

where $\omega(\xi, \mu) = \xi^3 + \frac{\mu^2}{\xi}$. We make the change of variables $(\zeta, \mu) = (\xi^3 + \mu^2/\xi, \mu)$, and it is to check that if $J(\xi, \mu)$ represents the jacobian, then in $A_\pm$, $|J(\xi, \mu)| \gtrsim |\xi|^2$ holds. Now assume that $\xi = \theta(\zeta, \mu)$, then the term above equals

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{i\mu y + it\zeta} [e^{i\theta(\zeta, \mu)x} \theta(\zeta, \mu) \widehat{u}_0(\theta(\zeta, \mu), \mu) \chi_{\tilde{A}_\pm} |J|^{-1}] d\zeta d\mu,$$

where $\tilde{A}_\pm$ is the transformation of $A_\pm$ under the given change of variables. Then by Plancherel's theorem

$$\begin{aligned} \|\partial_x S(t) P_\pm u_0(x)\|_{L_{y,t}^2} &= \|e^{i\theta(\zeta, \mu)x} \theta(\zeta, \mu) \widehat{u}_0(\theta(\zeta, \mu), \mu) \chi_{\tilde{A}_\pm} |J|^{-1}\|_{L_{\zeta, \mu}^2} \\ &= \left(\int_{\tilde{A}_\pm} |\theta(\zeta, \mu)|^2 |\widehat{u}_0|^2 |J|^{-2} d\zeta d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \left(\int |\xi|^2 |\widehat{u}_0|^2 |\xi|^{-2} d\xi d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \|u_0\|_{L_{x,y}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

To prove (2.22) we use a similar argument. We set $A_0 = \{|\xi| \sim \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}\}$, and we write

$$D_x^{1/2} S(t) P_0 u_0(x, y) = \int_{A_0} e^{i(\xi, \mu)(x, y)} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{it\omega(\xi, \mu)} \widehat{u}_0(\xi, \mu) d\xi d\mu.$$

We make the change of variables $(\xi, \rho) = (\xi, \xi^3 + \mu^2/\xi)$, and we observe that this time the estimate for the jacobian is $|J(\xi, \mu)| \gtrsim |\xi|$. We set $\mu = \gamma(\xi, \rho)$ and we continue the chain of inequalities above with

$$\int e^{i\xi x + it\rho} [e^{i\gamma(\xi, \rho)y} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{2}} \widehat{u}_0(\xi, \gamma(\xi, \rho)) \chi_{\tilde{A}_0} |J|^{-1}] d\rho d\xi,$$

where $\tilde{A}_0$ is the transformation of A_0 under the above change of variables. Then by Plancherel's theorem

$$\begin{aligned} \|D_x^{\frac{1}{2}} S(t) P_0 u_0(y)\|_{L_{x,t}^2} &= \|e^{i\gamma(\xi, \rho)y} |\xi|^{\frac{1}{2}} \widehat{u}_0(\xi, \gamma(\xi, \rho)) \chi_{\tilde{A}_0} |J|^{-1}\|_{L_{\xi, \rho}^2} \\ &= \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\xi| |\widehat{u}_0|^2 |J|^{-2} d\xi d\rho \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\lesssim \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\xi| |\widehat{u}_0|^2 |\xi|^{-1} d\xi d\mu \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \|u_0\|_{L_{x,y}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Using the argument of foliation with χ_j introduced to prove (2.20), one obtains

Corollary 1. *Let $\chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) = \chi_j(\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu))$ be as in Definition 2. Then*

$$(2.23) \quad \|(|\xi|^{\frac{1}{2}} \chi_{\{|\xi| \sim \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}\}} \hat{f}(\xi, \mu, \tau) \chi_j(\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)))^\vee\|_{L_y^\infty L_x^2 L_t^2} \lesssim 2^{\frac{j}{2}} \|\hat{f} \chi_j\|_{L_{\xi, \mu, \tau}^2}$$

$$(2.24) \quad \|(|\xi| \chi_{\{|\xi| >> \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}\}} \hat{f}(\xi, \mu, \tau) \chi_j(\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)))^\vee\|_{L_x^\infty L_y^2 L_t^2} \lesssim 2^{\frac{j}{2}} \|\hat{f} \chi_j\|_{L_{\xi, \mu, \tau}^2}$$

$$(2.25) \quad \|(|\xi| \chi_{\{|\xi| << \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}\}} \hat{f}(\xi, \mu, \tau) \chi_j(\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)))^\vee\|_{L_x^\infty L_y^2 L_t^2} \lesssim 2^{\frac{j}{2}} \|\hat{f} \chi_j\|_{L_{\xi, \mu, \tau}^2}.$$

On the other hand, using interpolation with the trivial L^2 norm estimate, we also obtain

Corollary 2. *Let $\chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) = \chi_j(\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu))$ be as in Definition 2. Then*

$$(2.26) \quad \|(|\xi|^{\frac{1}{4}} \chi_{\{|\xi| \sim \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}\}} \hat{f}(\xi, \mu, \tau) \chi_j(\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)))^\vee\|_{L_y^4 L_x^2 L_t^2} \lesssim 2^{\frac{j}{4}} \|\hat{f} \chi_j\|_{L_{\xi, \mu, \tau}^2}$$

$$(2.27) \quad \|(|\xi|^{1/2} \chi_{\{|\xi| >> \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}\}} \hat{f}(\xi, \mu, \tau) \chi_j(\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)))^\vee\|_{L_x^4 L_y^2 L_t^2} \lesssim 2^{j/4} \|\hat{f} \chi_j\|_{L_{\xi, \mu, \tau}^2}$$

$$(2.28) \quad \|(|\xi|^{1/2} \chi_{\{|\xi| << \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}\}} \hat{f}(\xi, \mu, \tau) \chi_j(\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)))^\vee\|_{L_x^4 L_y^2 L_t^2} \lesssim 2^{j/4} \|\hat{f} \chi_j\|_{L_{\xi, \mu, \tau}^2}$$

We finally introduce a maximal function estimate.

Proposition 6. (*maximal function estimate*) *Let T_m be the operator such that $\widehat{T_m(f)}(\xi, \mu, \tau) = m(\mu, \tau) \hat{f}(\xi, \mu, \tau)$. Then*

$$(2.29) \quad \|T_m(f)\|_{L_x^2 L_{y,t}^\infty} \leq C \|m\|_{L_{\mu,\tau}^2} \|\hat{f}\|_{L_{\xi,\mu,\tau}^2}.$$

Similarly, if $\widehat{T_w(f)}(\xi, \mu, \tau) = w(\xi, \tau) \hat{f}(\xi, \mu, \tau)$. Then

$$(2.30) \quad \|T_w(f)\|_{L_y^2 L_{x,t}^\infty} \leq C \|w\|_{L_{\xi,\tau}^2} \|\hat{f}\|_{L_{\xi,\mu,\tau}^2}.$$

Proof. We only prove (2.29). We first write

$$T_m f(x, y, t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \check{m}(y - y', t - t') f(x, y', t') dy' dt'.$$

Then

$$|T_m f(x, y, t)| \lesssim \|\check{m}\|_{L^2} \|f(x, \cdot, \cdot)\|_{L^2}.$$

To end the proof one just has to take the L^2 norm in the x variable. $\square$

It is also useful to observe that interpolating (2.29) and (2.30) with the trivial L^2 estimates, we obtain

$$(2.31) \quad \|T_m(f)\|_{L_x^2 L_{y,t}^4} \leq C \|m\|_{L_{\mu,\tau}^4} \|\hat{f}\|_{L_{\xi,\mu,\tau}^2},$$

$$(2.32) \quad \|T_w(f)\|_{L_y^2 L_{x,t}^4} \leq C \|w\|_{L_{\xi,\tau}^4} \|\hat{f}\|_{L_{\xi,\mu,\tau}^2}.$$

We end this section with a simple weighted Sobolev inequality that will be useful later.

Lemma 2.3. (*weighted Sobolev*) *Assume $w(\xi, \mu) \gtrsim 1$ for any $(\xi, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Then for any $\epsilon_0 \geq 0$, for any $p > 2$ and $\theta = (p - 2)/2p$,*

$$(2.33) \quad \|f\|_{L_\mu^p} \lesssim \|w(\xi, \cdot)^{\epsilon_0} f\|_{L_\mu^2}^{(1-\theta)} \|w(\xi, \cdot)^{-\epsilon_0} f'\|_{L_\mu^2}^\theta.$$

Proof. We write

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}f^2(\mu) &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\mu} \frac{d}{d\mu'}(f^2(\mu'))d\mu' \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\mu} f(\mu') \frac{d}{d\mu'}(f(\mu'))d\mu' = \int_{-\infty}^{\mu} w(\xi, \mu')^{\epsilon_0} f(\mu') w(\xi, \mu')^{-\epsilon_0} \frac{d}{d\mu'}(f(\mu'))d\mu' \\ &\leq \|w(\xi, \cdot)^{\epsilon_0} f\|_{L_{\mu}^2} \|w(\xi, \cdot)^{-\epsilon_0} f'\|_{L_{\mu}^2}. \end{aligned}$$

From here it follows that

$$(2.34) \quad \|f\|_{L^\infty} \leq \|w(\xi, \cdot)^{\epsilon_0} f\|_{L_{\mu}^2}^{\frac{1}{2}} \|w(\xi, \cdot)^{-\epsilon_0} f'\|_{L_{\mu}^2}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

If $p > 2$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |f|^p d\mu = \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f|^{p-2} |f|^2 d\mu \leq \|f\|_{L^\infty}^{p-2} \|f\|_{L^2}^2,$$

and by (2.34) it follows that

$$\|f\|_{L_{\mu}^p} \leq \|f\|_{L_{\mu}^2}^{2/p} \|w(\xi, \cdot)^{\epsilon_0} f\|_{L_{\mu}^2}^{(p-2)/2p} \|w(\xi, \cdot)^{-\epsilon_0} f'\|_{L_{\mu}^2}^{(p-2)/2p}$$

and because $w(\xi, \mu) \gtrsim 1$

$$\|f\|_{L_{\mu}^p} \leq \|w(\xi, \cdot)^{\epsilon_0} f\|_{L_{\mu}^2}^{(p+2)/2p} \|w(\xi, \cdot)^{-\epsilon_0} f'\|_{L_{\mu}^2}^{(p-2)/2p},$$

and the lemma is proved. $\square$

3. THE BILINEAR ESTIMATES

As announced at the end of Section 1, the core of the well-posedness result we present in this paper is contained in the following two theorems.

Theorem 3. *Assume $0 < \epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{8}$. Then for any $\frac{1}{4} < \epsilon < 1$, we have*

$$(3.1) \quad \|\partial_x(uv)\|_{X_{1-\epsilon_0, -\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C \|u\|_{X_{1-\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}} (\|v\|_{X_{1-\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}} + \|v\|_{X_{1-\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}}^{1-\epsilon} \|v\|_{Y_{1-\epsilon_0, -\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}}^{\epsilon})$$

$$(3.2) \quad + C \|v\|_{X_{1-\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}} (\|u\|_{X_{1-\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}} + \|u\|_{X_{1-\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}}^{1-\epsilon} \|u\|_{Y_{1-\epsilon_0, -\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}}^{\epsilon}).$$

The companion of the above bilinear estimate is

Theorem 4. *Assume $0 < \epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{16}$. Then for any $\frac{1}{4} < \epsilon < 1$, we have*

$$(3.3) \quad \|\partial_x(uv)\|_{Y_{1-\epsilon_0, -\epsilon_0, -\frac{1}{2}}} \leq C \|u\|_{Y_{1-\epsilon_0, -\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}} (\|v\|_{X_{1-\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}} + \|v\|_{X_{1-\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}}^{1-\epsilon} \|v\|_{Y_{1-\epsilon_0, -\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}}^{\epsilon})$$

$$(3.4) \quad + C \|v\|_{Y_{1-\epsilon_0, -\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}} (\|u\|_{X_{1-\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}} + \|u\|_{X_{1-\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}}^{1-\epsilon} \|u\|_{Y_{1-\epsilon_0, -\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}}^{\epsilon}).$$

Remark 3.1. We have not attempted to find the optimal value for ϵ_0 for which our argument can be carried out.

Remark 3.2. An estimate for the bilinear expression $D_x^{1/2}(uv)$ in spaces not involving weights already appeared in [21].

To give an idea of how the proof will be conducted we write the left hand side of the bilinear inequality in Theorem 3 using duality.

We have to estimate, for $g_j \geq 0$,

$$(3.5) \quad \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \sum_{m \geq 0} \int_{A^*} g_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_m(\xi) \chi_1(\xi, \mu) \chi_j(\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)) \\ \times |\xi| \max(1, |\xi|)^{1-\epsilon_0} |\hat{u}|(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1) |\hat{v}|(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2) d\xi_1 d\mu_1 d\tau_1 d\xi_2 d\mu_2 d\tau_2$$

and

$$(3.6) \quad \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \sum_{n \geq 0} \int_{A^*} g_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_n(\mu) \chi_2(\xi, \mu) \chi_j(\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)) \\ \times |\xi| \max(1, \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^{1-\epsilon_0} |\hat{u}|(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1) |\hat{v}|(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2) d\xi_1 d\mu_1 d\tau_1 d\xi_2 d\mu_2 d\tau_2,$$

where A^* is the set $\{\xi_1 + \xi_2 = \xi, \mu_1 + \mu_2 = \mu, \tau_1 + \tau_2 = \tau\}$ and $\|g_j \theta_m \chi_1 \chi_j\|_{L_{\xi, \mu, \tau}^2} \leq 1$ and $\|g_j \theta_n \chi_2 \chi_j\|_{L_{\xi, \mu, \tau}^2} \leq 1$. It is clear that by symmetry one can always assume that $|\xi_1| \geq |\xi_2|$. Based on Remark 1.2 one can easily understand that many different cases need to be considered in view of the fact that there will be a combination of interactions between “good” regions of type R_g , bad regions of type R_b , regions with relatively small or large frequencies. The whole analysis is complicated further by the fact that the spaces we use are anisotropic. We start by subdividing A^* into six domains of integration

$$(3.7) A_1 = A^* \cap \{|\xi_1| \geq |\xi_2|, |\xi_1| \leq 1\},$$

$$(3.8) A_2 = A^* \cap \{|\xi_1| \geq |\xi_2|, |\xi_1| > 1, |\xi_2| \sim |\xi_1|\},$$

$$(3.9) A_3 = A^* \cap \{|\xi_1| > 1, 1 < |\xi_2| \leq 10^{-10} |\xi_1|, |\mu_2|/|\xi_2| \gtrsim \max\{|\xi_1|, |\mu_1|/|\xi_1|\}\},$$

$$(3.10) A_4 = A^* \cap B \cap \{|\xi_1| > 1, |\xi_2| \leq 1, |\xi_2| \leq 10^{-10} |\xi_1|, |\mu_2|/|\xi_2| \gtrsim \max\{|\xi_1|, |\mu_1|/|\xi_1|\}\},$$

$$(3.11) A_5 = A^* \cap B^c \cap \{|\xi_1| > 1, |\xi_2| \leq 1, |\xi_2| \leq 10^{-10} |\xi_1|, |\mu_2|/|\xi_2| \gtrsim \max\{|\xi_1|, |\mu_1|/|\xi_1|\}\},$$

$$(3.12) A_6 = A^* \cap \{|\xi_1| > 1, |\xi_2| \leq 10^{-10} |\xi_1|, |\mu_2|/|\xi_2| \leq 10^{-10} \max\{|\xi_1|, |\mu_1|/|\xi_1|\}\},$$

where $B = \{|\xi_1| \geq \frac{1}{100} |\mu_1|/|\xi_1|\}$. We also use the auxiliary region

$$\tilde{A}_5(\epsilon_0) = \{|\mu_1/\xi_1 - \mu_2/\xi_2|^2 < 3/2 |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^2, |\xi_1|^{1+\alpha\epsilon_0} \leq |\mu_1/\xi_1|\},$$

where α will depend on ϵ_0 . The most delicate part of our estimate occurs in the region A_6 and it is only here that we need the weighted spaces and the Besov type norms. We start with a lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *If $\epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{8}$, then*

$$(3.13) \quad \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int_A g_j(\xi_1 + \xi_2, \mu_1 + \mu_2, \tau_1 + \tau_2) \chi_j(\tau_1 + \tau_2 - \omega(\xi_1 + \xi_2, \mu_1 + \mu_2)) \\ |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{\epsilon_0} \Pi_{i=1,2} \phi_i(\xi_i, \mu_i, \tau_i) \chi_{j_i}(\tau_i - \omega(\xi_i, \mu_i)) d\xi_i d\mu_i d\tau_i \\ \lesssim \sup_j \|g_j\|_{L^2} \Pi_{i=1,2} \sum_{j_i \geq 0} 2^{j_i/2} \|\phi_i \chi_{j_i}\|_{L^2},$$

where $A = A_k, k = 1, 2, 3, 4$ or $A = A_5 - \tilde{A}_5(\epsilon_0)$.

The proof that we present below gives a little more general result than the one stated. In particular we show that (3.13) holds in sets larger than A_3 and A_4 , namely in

$$\tilde{A}_3 = A * \cap \{|\xi_1| > 1, 1 < |\xi_2| \leq 10^{-10}|\xi_1|\},$$

and

$$\tilde{A}_4 = A * \cap B \cap \{|\xi_1| > 1, |\xi_2| \leq 1, |\xi_2| \leq 10^{-10}|\xi_1|\}.$$

Proof. For simplicity, for $i = 1, 2$, we set

$$\phi_i(\xi_i, \mu_i, \tau_i) \chi_{j_i}(\tau_i - \omega(\xi_i, \mu_i)) = \phi_{i,j_i}(\xi_i, \mu_i, \tau_i).$$

Also, whenever we use a dyadic decomposition either with respect to $|\xi_i| \sim 2^{m_i}$ or $|\mu_i| \sim 2^{n_i}$, we write

$$(3.14) \quad \phi_{i,j_i,m_i}(\xi_i, \mu_i, \tau_i) = \phi_{i,j_i} \chi_{\{|\xi_i| \sim 2^{m_i}\}}(\xi_i, \mu_i, \tau_i)$$

$$(3.15) \quad \phi_{i,j_i,n_i}(\xi_i, \mu_i, \tau_i) = \phi_{i,j_i} \chi_{\{|\mu_i| \sim 2^{n_i}\}}(\xi_i, \mu_i, \tau_i).$$

We prove the theorem by analyzing the integral in (3.13) on the different regions.

Region A_1 : Here $|\xi_1 + \xi_2| \lesssim 1$ and we can simply use the Strichartz inequality (2.19).

Region A_2 : Here we can assume also that $|\xi_1 + \xi_2| > 1$, otherwise we go back to the argument used in the region A_1 . We dyadically decompose with respect to $|\xi_1| \sim 2^{m_1}$ (hence $|\xi_2| \sim 2^{m_1}$) and we rewrite the left hand side of (3.13) as

$$(3.16) \quad \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{j,j_1,j_2} 2^{-j/2} \int g_j \chi_j |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{\epsilon_0} \Pi_{i=1,2} \phi_{i,j_i,m_i} d\tau_i d\xi_i d\mu_i$$

We now consider two cases:

Case A: $j > 2\epsilon_0 m_1$. We use the Strichartz inequality (2.19) and (3.16) can be bounded by

$$\sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{j > 2\epsilon_0 m_1} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2 + m_1 \epsilon_0} \|g_j \chi_j\|_{L^2} \Pi_{i=1,2} 2^{j_i/2} \|\phi_{i,j_i,m_i}\|_{L^2}$$

and (3.13) follows in this case.

Case B: $0 \leq j \leq 2\epsilon_0 m_1$. We change variable in τ_1 and τ_2 by setting $(\tau_i - \omega(\xi_i, \mu_i)) = \theta_i$ and we write the left hand side of (3.13) as

$$(3.17) \quad \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int_A g_j(\xi_1 + \xi_2, \mu_1 + \mu_2, \theta_1 + \omega(\xi_1, \mu_1) + \theta_2 + \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2)) \\ \chi_j(\theta_1 + \omega(\xi_1, \mu_1) + \theta_2 + \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2) - \omega(\xi_1 + \xi_2, \mu_1 + \mu_2)) \\ |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{\epsilon_0} \Pi_{i=1,2} \phi_i(\xi_i, \mu_i, \theta_i + \omega(\xi_i, \mu_i)) \chi_{j_i}(\theta_i) d\xi_i d\mu_i d\theta_i.$$

From (1.5) we also have that

$$(3.18) \quad 1 + \left| \theta_1 + \theta_2 + \frac{\xi_1 \xi_2}{(\xi_1 + \xi_2)} \left(\left(\frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} - \frac{\mu_2}{\xi_2} \right)^2 - 3(\xi_1 + \xi_2)^2 \right) \right| \sim 2^j.$$

Case B1: $\left| \frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} - \frac{\mu_2}{\xi_2} \right|^2 \leq 3/2 |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^2$.

Then from (3.18) and (1.5) it follows that $|\xi_1| |\xi_2| |\xi_1 + \xi_2| \lesssim 2^{\max(j_1, j_2, j)}$. Because now $|\xi_1 + \xi_2| > 1$, if $j = \max(j_1, j_2, j)$, then $2^{2m_1} \lesssim 2^{2\epsilon_0 m_1}$, a contradiction if $\epsilon_0 < 1$ for m_1 large enough. So by symmetry we can assume that $|\xi_1 + \xi_2| \lesssim 2^{(j_1 - 2m_1)}$, hence

$|\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{\epsilon_0} \lesssim 2^{\epsilon_0(j_1 - 2m_1)}$. We can then continue⁴ the estimate of (3.17) by using Strichartz inequality (2.19) with

$$(3.19) \quad \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{j \leq 2\epsilon_0 m_1} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{-2\epsilon_0 m_1} 2^{\epsilon_0 j_1} \|g_j \chi_j\|_{L^2} \|\phi_{1, j_1, m_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{2, j_2, m_1}\|_{L^2}$$

and after Cauchy-Schwarz in m_1 this gives (3.13) provided $\epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{2}$.

Case B2: $\left| \frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} - \frac{\mu_2}{\xi_2} \right|^2 > 3/2 |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^2$.

Here we consider the following change of variables

$$(3.20) \quad \begin{aligned} u &= \xi_1 + \xi_2 \\ v &= \mu_1 + \mu_2 \\ w &= \omega(\xi_1, \mu_1) + \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2) + \theta_1 + \theta_2 \\ \mu_2 &= \mu_2. \end{aligned}$$

The Jacobian associated to this change of variable is

$$(3.21) \quad J_\mu = 3(\xi_1^2 - \xi_2^2) - \left(\left(\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \right)^2 - \left(\frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|} \right)^2 \right).$$

We observe that, for fixed $\theta_1, \theta_2, \xi_1, \xi_2, \mu_1$, the set where the free variable μ_2 can range so that (3.18) is verified is a union of two symmetric intervals and the length of these intervals is small. More precisely, if we denote with Δ_{μ_2} this length, then

$$(3.22) \quad \Delta_{\mu_2} \lesssim 2^{j-m_1}.$$

To see this we introduce the function

$$f(\mu) = \theta_1 + \theta_2 + \frac{\xi_1 \xi_2}{(\xi_1 + \xi_2)} \left(\left(\frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} - \frac{\mu}{\xi_2} \right)^2 - 3(\xi_1 + \xi_2)^2 \right).$$

It's easy to see that $|f'(\mu)| \gtrsim |\xi_1|$, hence (3.22) follows. We now consider two subcases.

Case B2a: $\left| 3(\xi_1^2 - \xi_2^2) - \left(\left(\frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} \right)^2 - \left(\frac{\mu_2}{\xi_2} \right)^2 \right) \right| > 1$.

We make the change of variable (3.20) (now $|J_\mu| > 1$). Denote with $H(u, v, w, \mu_2, \theta_1, \theta_2)$ the transformation of

$$\Pi_{i=1,2} \phi_{i, j_i, m_1}(\xi_i, \mu_i, \theta_i + \omega(\xi_i, \mu_i)) \chi_{j_i}(\theta_i)$$

under the above change of variables. Then (3.17) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m_1, j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq 2\epsilon_0 m_1} 2^{-j/2} 2^{\epsilon_0 m_1} \int g_j \chi_j(u, v, w) \\ & |J_\mu|^{-1} H(u, v, w, \mu_2, \theta_1, \theta_2) du dv dw d\mu_2 d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{m_1, j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq 2\epsilon_0 m_1} 2^{-j/2} 2^{\epsilon_0 m_1} 2^{(j-m_1)/2} \\ & \int g_j \chi_j(u, v, w) \left(\int_{\mu_2} |J_\mu|^{-2} H^2(u, v, w, \mu_2, \theta_1, \theta_2) d\mu_2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} du dv dw d\theta_1 d\theta_2. \end{aligned}$$

⁴Here one needs to take the inverse Fourier transform of ϕ_2 and of g in L^4 and that of ϕ_1 in L^2 .

Now we observe that by Cauchy-Schwarz and the inverse change of variable we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \int g_j \chi_j(u, v, w) \left(\int_{\mu_2} |J_\mu|^{-2} H^2(u, v, w, \mu_2, \theta_1, \theta_2) d\mu_2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} dudvdwd\theta_1 d\theta_2 \\
 & \leq \|g_j \chi_j\|_{L^2} \left(\int \left(\int |J_\mu|^{-2} H^2(u, v, w, \mu_2, \theta_1, \theta_2) dudvdwd\mu_2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \right) \\
 & \lesssim \|g_j \chi_j\|_{L^2} \left(\int \left(\int |J_\mu|^{-1} H^2(u, v, w, \mu_2, \theta_1, \theta_2) dudvdwd\mu_2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \right) \\
 & \lesssim \|g_j \chi_j\|_{L^2} \left(\int \left(\int \Pi_{i=1,2} \phi_{i,j_i,m_1}^2(\xi_i, \mu_i, \theta_i + \omega(\xi_i, \mu_i)) \chi_{j_i}(\theta_i) d\xi_1 d\xi_2 d\mu_1 d\mu_2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \right) \\
 & \lesssim \|g_j \chi_j\|_{L^2} 2^{j_1/2} 2^{j_2/2} \left(\int \int \Pi_{i=1,2} \phi_{i,j_i,m_1}^2(\xi_i, \mu_i, \theta_i + \omega(\xi_i, \mu_i)) d\xi_1 d\xi_2 d\mu_1 d\mu_2 d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
 & \lesssim \|g_j \chi_j\|_{L^2} \Pi_{i=1,2} 2^{j_i/2} \|\phi_{i,j_i,m_1}\|_{L^2}
 \end{aligned}$$

which inserted above, after a sum on j gives

$$\sum_{m_1, j_1, j_2 \geq 0} [1 + (2\epsilon_0 m_1)] 2^{\epsilon_0 m_1} 2^{-m_1/2} \|g_j \chi_j\|_{L^2} \Pi_{i=1,2} 2^{j_i/2} \|\phi_{i,j_i,m_1}\|_{L^2}$$

and from here we obtain again (3.13) for $\epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{2}$.

Case B2b: $\left| 3(\xi_1^2 - \xi_2^2) - \left(\left(\frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} \right)^2 - \left(\frac{\mu_2}{\xi_2} \right)^2 \right) \right| \leq 1$.

In this case the change of variables above cannot be used because the Jacobian may become zero. We consider instead the change of variables in which we leave ξ_1 free:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.23) \quad & u = \xi_1 + \xi_2 \\
 & v = \mu_1 + \mu_2 \\
 & w = \omega(\xi_1, \mu_1) + \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2) + \theta_1 + \theta_2 \\
 & \xi_1 = \xi_1.
 \end{aligned}$$

In this case the Jacobian J_ξ is given by

$$(3.24) \quad J_\xi = \frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} - \frac{\mu_2}{\xi_2},$$

and because we are in Case B2, it follows that

$$|J_\xi| \gtrsim |\xi_1 + \xi_2| > 1.$$

We observe that, for fixed $\theta_1, \theta_2, \xi_2, \mu_1, \mu_2$, the set where the free variable ξ_1 can range so that we remain in Case B is a union of two symmetric intervals and the length of these interval is small. More precisely, if we denote with Δ_{ξ_1} this length, then

$$(3.25) \quad \Delta_{\xi_1} \lesssim 2^{-m_1}.$$

To see this we introduce the function

$$h(\xi) = 3(\xi^2 - \xi_2^2) - \left(\left(\frac{\mu_1}{\xi} \right)^2 - \left(\frac{\mu_2}{\xi_2} \right)^2 \right).$$

We compute

$$h'(\xi) = 6\xi - 2(\mu_1/\xi)(-\mu_1/\xi^2) = 6\xi + 2(\mu_1/\xi)^2\xi^{-1}$$

and we notice that $h'(\xi)$ has the same sign as ξ , hence $|h'(\xi)| \gtrsim |\xi|$, and (3.25) follows. Again denote with $H(u, v, w, \xi_1, \theta_1, \theta_2)$ the transformation of⁵ $\Pi_{i=1,2}\phi_{i,j_i}(\xi_i, \mu_i, \theta_i)$ under the change of variables (3.23). Then (3.17) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m_1, j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq 2\epsilon_0 m_1} 2^{-j/2} 2^{\epsilon_0 m_1} \int g_j \chi_j(u, v, w) \\ & \times |J_\xi|^{-1} H(u, v, w, \xi_1, \theta_1, \theta_2) du dv dw d\xi_1 d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{m_1, j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq 2\epsilon_0 m_1} 2^{-j/2} 2^{\epsilon_0 m_1} 2^{-m_1/2} \\ & \int g_j \chi_j(u, v, w) \left(\int_{\xi_1} |J_\xi|^{-2} H^2(u, v, w, \xi_1, \theta_1, \theta_2) d\xi_1 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} du dv dw d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \\ & \lesssim \sum_{m_1, j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq 2\epsilon_0 m_1} 2^{-j/2} 2^{\epsilon_0 m_1} 2^{-m_1/2} \Pi_{i=1,2} 2^{j_i/2} \|\phi_{i,j_i,m_i}\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

and this again gives (3.13) for $\epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{2}$.

Region A_3 : In this region, (see (3.9)), $|\xi_1 + \xi_2| \sim |\xi_1|$. We dyadically decompose with respect to $|\xi_1| \sim 2^{m_1}$ (hence $|\xi_1 + \xi_2| \sim 2^{m_1}$). The left hand side of (3.13) now becomes

$$(3.26) \quad \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{j, j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} 2^{m_1 \epsilon_0} \int g_{j,m_1} \chi_j \phi_{1,j_1,m_1} \phi_{2,j_1} d\xi_i d\mu_i d\tau_i$$

where the arguments of the functions as in (3.13). We consider two subcases. For $0 < \delta \ll 1$, to be fixed, we have:

Case A: $j > (2 + 2\delta)\epsilon_0 m_1$, $0 < \delta \ll 1$. We use Strichartz inequality (2.19) and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (3.26) & \lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq 2(1+\delta)\epsilon_0 m_1} 2^{-j/2} 2^{m_1 \epsilon_0} \|g_{j,m_1} \chi_j\|_{L^2} 2^{j_1/2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{1,j_1,m_1}\|_{L^2} \|\phi_{2,j_2}\|_{L^2} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 1} 2^{-m_1 \delta \epsilon_0} \sup_j \|g_j \chi_j\|_{L^2} 2^{j_1/2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{1,j_1,m_1}\|_{L^2} \|\phi_{2,j_2}\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Case B: $j \leq (2 + 2\delta)\epsilon_0 m_1$.

Case B1: $\left| \frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} - \frac{\mu_2}{\xi_2} \right|^2 \leq 3/2 |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^2$.

As in region A_2 , it follows that $|\xi_1| |\xi_2| |\xi_1 + \xi_2| \lesssim 2^{\max(j_1, j_2, j)}$ and since $|\xi_2| > 1$ and $|\xi_1| \sim |\xi_1 + \xi_2|$, we obtain that $|\xi_1|^2 \lesssim 2^{\max(j_1, j_2, j)}$. If $j = \max(j_1, j_2, j)$, then $2^{2m_1} \lesssim 2^{(2+2\delta)\epsilon_0 m_1}$, a contradiction if $\epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{1+\delta}$ for m_1 large enough. Assume then that $j_1 = \max(j_1, j_2, j)$. It follows that $|\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{\epsilon_0} \lesssim 2^{\epsilon_0(j_1 - m_1)}$ and thanks to Strichartz⁶ inequality (2.19) we can

⁵Here we are using the notation in (3.14).

⁶Here one needs to take the anti Fourier transform of g and of ϕ_2 in L^4 and that of ϕ_1 in L^2 .

continue the chain of inequalities with

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \leq 2(1+\delta)\epsilon_0 m_1} 2^{-j/2} \|g_{j, m_1} \chi_j\|_{L^2} 2^{j/2} 2^{\epsilon_0(j_1 - m_1)} \|\phi_{1, j_1, m_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{2, j_2}\|_{L^2} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{\epsilon_0(j_1 - m_1)} [(2 + 2\delta)\epsilon_0 m_1 + 1] 2^{j_2/2} (\sup_j \|g_j \chi_j\|_{L^2}) \|\phi_{1, j_1, m_1}\|_{L^2} \|\phi_{2, j_2}\|_{L^2}, \end{aligned}$$

and this gives (3.13) provided $\epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{2}$. Clearly the case when $j_2 = \max(j_1, j_2, j)$ is similar.

Case B2: $\left| \frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} - \frac{\mu_2}{\xi_2} \right|^2 > 3/2 |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^2$.

As we did for region A_2 here also we consider two subcases.

Case B2a: $\left| 3(\xi_1^2 - \xi_2^2) - \left(\left(\frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} \right)^2 - \left(\frac{\mu_2}{\xi_2} \right)^2 \right) \right| > 1$.

We make the change of variable (3.20), for which now $|J_\mu| > 1$ and we observe that also in this region (3.22) holds. Then (3.26) can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m_1, j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq (2+2\delta)\epsilon_0 m_1} 2^{-j/2} 2^{\epsilon_0 m_1} 2^{(j - m_1)/2} \|g_j \chi_j\|_{L^2} 2^{j_1/2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{1, j_1, m_1}\|_{L^2} \|\phi_{2, j_2}\|_{L^2} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{m_1, j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{(\epsilon_0 - \frac{1}{2})m_1} ((2 + 2\delta)\epsilon_0 m_1) (\sup_j \|g_j \chi_j\|_{L^2}) 2^{j_1/2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{1, j_1, m_1}\|_{L^2} \|\phi_{2, j_2}\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

which again gives (3.13) for $\epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{2}$.

Case B2b: $\left| 3(\xi_1^2 - \xi_2^2) - \left(\left(\frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} \right)^2 - \left(\frac{\mu_2}{\xi_2} \right)^2 \right) \right| \leq 1$.

We consider now the change of variables (3.23) and we observe that

$$|J_\xi| = \left| \frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} - \frac{\mu_2}{\xi_2} \right| \gtrsim |\xi_1 + \xi_2| \sim 2^{m_1}.$$

We also remark that in this region (3.25) holds too. Repeating the argument in Case B2b of region A_2 the left hand side of (3.13) can be bounded by

$$\sum_{m_1, j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq (2+2\delta)\epsilon_0 m_1} 2^{-j/2} 2^{\epsilon_0 m_1} 2^{-m_1/2} \|g_j \chi_j\|_{L^2} 2^{j_1/2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{1, j_1, m_1}\|_{L^2} \|\phi_{2, j_2}\|_{L^2},$$

and this concludes the estimate in A_3 for $\epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{2}$.

Region A_4 . Notice that we only need to restrict the proof to the case when $0 \leq j \leq (2 + 2\delta)\epsilon_0 m_1$ and $\left| \frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} - \frac{\mu_2}{\xi_2} \right|^2 \leq 3/2 |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^2$, since in the other situations (Case A in A_3 and case B_2 in A_3) and we didn't use the assumption $|\xi_2| \geq 1$. Observe that by the above restriction we also have that

$$(3.27) \quad \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|} \lesssim \max\left(\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}, |\xi_1|\right)$$

We consider two cases.

Case A: $|\xi_2| |\xi_1|^{1+\alpha\epsilon_0} \geq 1$, for some $\alpha > 0$ to be determined later.

Going back to the argument presented in Case B1 in region A_3 , we obtain $|\xi_1|^{1-\alpha\epsilon_0} \lesssim 2^{\max(j_1, j_2, j)}$. If we let

$$(3.28) \quad \epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{2 + 2\delta + \alpha},$$

then $\max(j_1, j_2, j) = \max(j_1, j_2)$. Let's assume $\max(j_1, j_2) = j_1$ and $\theta > 0$ and small. Then $2^{\epsilon_0 m_1} \lesssim 2^{j_1 \delta_0} 2^{-\sigma_0 m_1}$, where

$$\delta_0 = \frac{\epsilon_0}{(1 - \alpha \epsilon_0)(1 - \theta)}, \text{ and } \sigma_0 = \frac{\epsilon_0 \theta}{1 - \theta}.$$

Notice that if $0 < \theta \ll 1$, from (3.28) it follows that $\delta_0 \leq \frac{1}{2}$. We then use Strichartz and we bound the left hand side of (3.17) with

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m_1, j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq (2+2\delta)\epsilon_0 m_1} 2^{-j/2} 2^{\delta_0 j_1} 2^{-\sigma_0 m_1} 2^{j/2} (\sup_j \|g_j \chi_j\|_{L^2}) 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{1, j_1, m_1}\|_{L^2} \|\phi_{2, j_2}\|_{L^2} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{m_1, j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{\delta_0 j_1} 2^{-\sigma_0 m_1} (2 + 2\delta) \epsilon_0 m_1 (\sup_j \|g_j \chi_j\|_{L^2}) 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{1, j_1, m_1}\|_{L^2} \|\phi_{2, j_2}\|_{L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

The result is given by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality in m_1 . The argument when $\max(j_1, j_2) = j_2$ is similar.

Case B: $|\xi_2| |\xi_1|^{1+\alpha \epsilon_0} < 1$.

From (3.27) and the definition of A_4 in (3.10), we also have $|\mu_2| \leq |\xi_2| |\xi_1| \lesssim |\xi_2| |\xi_1|^{1+\alpha \epsilon_0} \lesssim 1$. We consider two subcases.

Case B1: $\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \leq \frac{1}{100} |\xi_1|$.

Here we use smoothing effect and the maximal function inequalities. Let's start by assuming that $|\mu_2|^2 / |\xi_2| \lesssim 2^{j_2}$. Then $|\omega(\xi_2, \mu_2)|, |\tau_2| \lesssim 2^{j_2}, |\mu_2| \lesssim 1$. We now set $m(\mu_2, \tau_2) = \chi(\mu_2, \tau_2)$, the characteristic function of the projection of the region of integration onto the $\mu_2 - \tau_2$ plane. Then

$$\|m\|_{L^4_{\mu_2, \tau_2}} \sim 2^{j_2/4}.$$

We then use Plancherel, Hölder with the three spaces $L^4_{x,y,t} - L^4_x L^2_y L^2_t - L^2_x L^4_y L^4_t$ and inequalities (2.27) and (2.31) to bound (3.17) with

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m_1, j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq (2+2\delta)\epsilon_0 m_1} 2^{-j/2} 2^{(\epsilon_0 - \frac{1}{2})m_1} 2^{j/2} \|g_j \chi_j\|_{L^2} 2^{j_1/4} \|\phi_{1, j_1, m_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/4} \|\phi_{2, j_2}\|_{L^2} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{m_1, j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{(\epsilon_0 - \frac{1}{2})m_1} [1 + (2 + 2\delta) \epsilon_0 m_1] (\sup_j \|g_j \chi_j\|_{L^2}) 2^{j_2/4} 2^{j_1/4} \|\phi_{1, j_1, m_1}\|_{L^2} \|\phi_{2, j_2}\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

and if $\epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{2}$ the lemma is proved also in this case. If $|\mu_2|^2 / |\xi_2| \gg 2^{j_2}$, then $|\omega(\xi_2, \mu_2)| \sim |\mu_2|^2 / |\xi_2|, |\tau_2| \sim |\mu_2|^2 / |\xi_2|$ and $|\tau_2 - \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2)| \sim 2^{j_2}$. From (3.27) we have

$$(3.29) \quad |\mu_2| \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|} \lesssim |\xi_2| |\xi_1|^2 \lesssim |\xi_2| |\xi_1|^{1+\alpha \epsilon_0} |\xi_1|^{1-\alpha \epsilon_0} \lesssim 1 \cdot |\xi_1|^{1-\alpha \epsilon_0}.$$

In this case

$$\|m\|_{L^4_{\mu_2, \tau_2}} \sim 2^{m_1(1-\alpha \epsilon_0)/4}.$$

We then use again Plancherel, Hölder with the three spaces $L^4_{x,y,t} - L^4_x L^2_y L^2_t - L^2_x L^4_y L^4_t$ and inequalities (2.27) and (2.31) to bound the left hand side of (3.26) with

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m_1, j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq (2+2\delta)\epsilon_0 m_1} 2^{(\epsilon_0 - \frac{1}{2})m_1} \|g_j \chi_j\|_{L^2} 2^{j_1/4} \|\phi_{1, j_1, m_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{m_1(1-\alpha \epsilon_0)/4} \|\phi_{2, j_2}\|_{L^2} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{m_1, j_1, j_2 \geq 0} [1 + (2 + 2\delta) \epsilon_0 m_1] (\sup_j \|g_j \chi_j\|_{L^2}) 2^{(\epsilon_0 - \frac{1}{2})m_1} 2^{m_1(1-\alpha \epsilon_0)/4} 2^{j_1/4} \|\phi_{1, j_1, m_1}\|_{L^2} \|\phi_{2, j_2}\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

and if $\alpha > 4$, for any ϵ_0 , the sum with respect to m_1 can be done and then (3.13) is proved also in this case.

Case B2: $\frac{1}{100}|\xi_1| \leq \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \leq 100|\xi_1|$.

Here we use (2.26). Let's start by assuming that $|\mu_2|^2/|\xi_2| \leq 2^{j_2}$. Clearly now $|\tau_2| \lesssim 2^{j_2}$ and $|\xi_2| \lesssim 1$. We use Plancherel, Hölder with the three spaces $L_{x,y,t}^4 - L_y^4 L_x^2 L_t^2 - L_y^2 L_x^4 L_t^4$ and inequalities (2.26) and (2.32) to bound the left hand side of (3.13) with

$$\sum_{m_1, j_1, j_2 \geq 0} [1 + (2 + 2\delta)\epsilon_0 m_1] (\sup_j \|g_j \chi_j\|_{L^2}) 2^{(\epsilon_0 - \frac{1}{4})m_1} 2^{j_1/4} \|\phi_{1,j_1,m_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/4} \|\phi_{2,j_2}\|_{L^2}$$

and if $\epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{4}$ then (3.13) is proved also in this case. Assume now that $|\mu_2|^2/|\xi_2| \gg 2^{j_2}$. Then by (3.29) $|\tau_2| \lesssim |\mu_2|^2/|\xi_2| \lesssim |\xi_1|^{1-\alpha\epsilon_0}$, so that $\|w\|_{L_{\xi_2,\tau_2}^2} \lesssim 2^{m_1(1-\alpha\epsilon_0)/4}$. We use Plancherel, Hölder with the three spaces $L_{x,y,t}^4 - L_y^4 L_x^2 L_t^2 - L_y^2 L_x^4 L_t^4$ and inequalities (2.26) and (2.32) to bound the left hand side of (3.26) with

$$\sum_{m_1, j_1, j_2 \geq 0} [1 + (2 + 2\delta)\epsilon_0 m_1] (\sup_j \|g_j \chi_j\|_{L^2}) 2^{(\epsilon_0 - \frac{1}{4})m_1} 2^{j_1/4} \|\phi_{1,j_1,m_1}\|_{L^2} (2^{j_2/4} + 2^{m_1(1-\alpha\epsilon_0)/4}) \|\phi_{2,j_2}\|_{L^2}$$

and if $\alpha > 4$, then the lemma follows in this case too.

Region $A_5 - \tilde{A}_5(\epsilon_0)$. Also in this case we can assume that $0 \leq j \leq (2 + 2\delta)\epsilon_0 m_1$, and $\left|\frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} - \frac{\mu_2}{\xi_2}\right|^2 \leq 3/2|\xi_1 + \xi_2|^2$, since in the other situation we didn't use the assumption $|\xi_2| \geq 1$. Also notice that here too (3.27) holds, hence $\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \sim \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|}$. Because we are in $A_5 - \tilde{A}_5(\epsilon_0)$, to these restrictions we have to add $|\xi_1|^{1+\alpha\epsilon} \gg \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}$, which in turn gives

$$(3.30) \quad |\mu_2| \ll |\xi_1|^{1+\alpha\epsilon_0} |\xi_2|.$$

We consider two subcases.

Case A: $|\xi_1|^{1+\alpha\epsilon_0} |\xi_2| \geq 1$.

This case is identical to Case A in region A_4 .

Case B: $|\xi_1|^{1+\alpha\epsilon_0} |\xi_2| < 1$.

By (3.30) we now have that $|\mu_2| \lesssim 1$. If $|\mu_2|^2/|\xi_2| \leq 2^{j_2}$ we can use the same arguments presented in the first part of Case B1 in region A_4 , by replacing (2.27) with (2.28). If $|\mu_2|^2/|\xi_2| \gg 2^{j_2}$, we have that $|\tau_2| \sim |\mu_2|^2/|\xi_2|$ and $|\tau_2 - \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2)| \sim 2^{j_2}$. We estimate

$$|\mu_2| |\mu_2|/|\xi_2| \lesssim |\xi_2| (|\mu_1|/|\xi_1|)^2 \lesssim |\xi_2| |\xi_1|^{1+\alpha\epsilon_0} |\xi_1|^{1+\alpha\epsilon_0} \lesssim 1 \cdot |\xi_1|^{1+\alpha\epsilon_0}$$

and from here on we can proceed like in the second part of Case B1 in region A_4 , again by replacing (2.27) with (2.28). We then obtain:

$$\sum_{m_1, j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq (2+2\delta)\epsilon_0 m_1} (\sup_j \|g_j \chi_j\|_{L^2}) 2^{(\epsilon_0 - \frac{1}{2})m_1} 2^{m_1(1+\alpha\epsilon_0)/4} 2^{j_1/4} \|\phi_{1,j_1,m_1}\|_{L^2} \|\phi_{2,j_2}\|_{L^2},$$

and if $(\epsilon_0 - \frac{1}{2}) + (1 + \alpha\epsilon_0)/4 < 0$, or $\epsilon_0(1 + \alpha/4) < \frac{1}{4}$, we can sum in m_1 . This is always possible for $\epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{8}$, with some $\alpha > 4$. The analysis of this case concludes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 3. To make the presentation more clear we summarize below the main cases considered in our analysis ⁷.

⁷Recall that here $\xi = \xi_1 + \xi_2$ and $\mu = \mu_1 + \mu_2$.

- Region A_1
 - Case A: $|\xi| \geq \frac{1}{2}|\mu|/|\xi|$
 - Case B: $|\xi| < \frac{1}{2}|\mu|/|\xi|$
 - * Case B1: $|\mu_1| \leq |\mu_2|$
 - * Case B2: $|\mu_1| > |\mu_2|$
- Region A_2
 - Case A: $|\xi| \geq \frac{1}{2}|\mu|/|\xi|$
 - Case B: $|\xi| < \frac{1}{2}|\mu|/|\xi|$
 - * Case B1: $|\mu_1| \leq |\mu_2|$
 - * Case B2: $|\mu_1| > |\mu_2|$
- Region $A_3 \cup A_4 \cup (A_5 - \tilde{A}_5(\epsilon_0))$
 - Case A: $|\xi| \geq \frac{1}{2}|\mu|/|\xi|$
 - * Case A1: $|\xi_1| \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}$
 - * Case A2: $|\xi_1| \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}$
 - Case B: $|\xi| < 1/2|\mu|/|\xi|$
 - * Case B1: $|\mu_1| \leq |\mu_2|$
 - * Case B2: $|\mu_1| > |\mu_2|$
- Region $A_5 \cap \tilde{A}_5(\epsilon_0)$
 - Case A: $|\xi| \geq \frac{1}{2}|\mu|/|\xi|$
 - Case B: $|\xi| < \frac{1}{2}|\mu|/|\xi|$
- Region A_6
 - Case A: $|\xi_1| \geq 10^2 \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}$
 - Case B: $|\xi_1| \leq 10^{-2} \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}$
 - Case C: $10^{-2} \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \leq |\xi_1| \leq 10^2 \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}$

Proof of Theorem 3. We reexpress the left hand side of (3.1) in Theorem 3 using duality and we obtain (3.5) and (3.6). We analyze these expressions on the regions described in (3.7)-(3.12). For the estimates in the regions A_1 through A_5 we find it convenient to normalize the functions u and v so that the expression in the right hand side of the bilinear inequality involves only L^2 norms. So define

$$(3.31) \quad \phi_{1,j_1}(\xi, \mu, \tau) = \max(1, |\xi|, |\mu|/|\xi|)^{1-\epsilon_0} \hat{u}|_{\chi_{j_1}}(\xi, \mu, \tau),$$

$$(3.32) \quad \phi_{2,j_2}(\xi, \mu, \tau) = \max(1, |\xi|, |\mu|/|\xi|)^{1-\epsilon_0} \hat{v}|_{\chi_{j_2}}(\xi, \mu, \tau).$$

If we use the identities $\mu = \mu_1 + \mu_2$ and $\xi = \xi_1 + \xi_2, \tau = \tau_1 + \tau_2$, (3.31) and (3.32), we can rewrite the left hand side of (3.5) as

$$(3.33) \quad \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{m \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int_{A^*} g_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \chi_1(\xi_1, \mu) \chi_j(\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)) \theta_m(\xi) |\xi_1 + \xi_2| \\ \max(1, |\xi_1 + \xi_2|)^{1-\epsilon_0} \frac{\phi_{1,j_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1)}{\max(1, |\xi_1|, \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|})^{1-\epsilon_0}} \frac{\phi_{2,j_2}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2)}{\max(1, |\xi_2|, \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|})^{1-\epsilon_0}} d\xi_1 d\xi_2 d\mu_1 d\mu_2 d\tau_1 d\tau_2$$

and the left hand side of (3.6) as

$$(3.34) \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{n \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int_{A^*} g_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \chi_1(\xi_1, \mu) \chi_j(\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)) \theta_n(\mu) |\xi_1 + \xi_2| \\ \max(1, |\mu_1 + \mu_2|/|\xi_1 + \xi_2|)^{1-\epsilon_0} \frac{\phi_{1,j_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1)}{\max(1, |\xi_1|, \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|})^{1-\epsilon_0}} \frac{\phi_{2,j_2}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2)}{\max(1, |\xi_2|, \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|})^{1-\epsilon_0}} d\xi_1 d\xi_2 d\mu_1 d\mu_2.$$

Below, case A will always correspond to the estimate (3.33), while case B will correspond to the estimate for (3.34). Note that in what follows, χ_1 and χ_2 will always denote the functions introduced in Definition 1, and χ_j the ones defined in Definition 2.

Region A_1 .

Case A: $|\xi| \geq \frac{1}{2}|\mu|/|\xi|$.

Note that here $|\xi_1 + \xi_2| \leq 2$ so the sum in m is finite and we can simply use the Strichartz inequality (2.19) and the fact that $l^1 \subset l^2$, to obtain

$$(3.33) \lesssim \sup_{m,j} \|g_j \chi_1 \chi_j \theta_m\|_{L^2} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \Pi_{i=1,2} 2^{j_i/2} \|\phi_{i,j_i}\|_{L^2}$$

and the theorem follows in this case.

Case B: $|\xi| < \frac{1}{2}|\mu|/|\xi|$.

If $\frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|} \leq 1$, it follows that $|\xi| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and hence $|\mu| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, that is the sum on n in (3.34) reduces to a finite sum and we proceed as above using the Strichartz inequality (2.19). So we can assume that $\frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|} > 1$. In this case (3.34) reduces to

$$(3.35) \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{n \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int_{A_1} g_j \chi_2 \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_n(\mu) |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{\epsilon_0} |\mu_1 + \mu_2|^{1-\epsilon_0} \\ \frac{\phi_{1,j_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1)}{\max(1, |\xi_1|, \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|})^{1-\epsilon_0}} \frac{\phi_{2,j_2}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2)}{\max(1, |\xi_2|, \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|})^{1-\epsilon_0}}.$$

We then consider two subcases.

Case B1: $|\mu_1| \leq |\mu_2|$.

If $\frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|} \leq |\xi_2|$ then $|\mu_2| \leq 2, |\mu_1 + \mu_2| \leq 4$. Again the sum on n reduces to a finite sum and because still $|\xi_1 + \xi_2| \leq 1$ we go back to the previous case. If $\frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|} > |\xi_2|$ we introduce a dyadic decomposition with respect to μ_2 and we set $|\mu_2| \sim 2^{n_2}$. Then $|\mu_1 + \mu_2| \leq C|\mu_2| \leq C2^{n_2}$ and we can write $1 + |\mu_1 + \mu_2| \sim 2^{n_2+1-r}$, $0 \leq r \leq n_2$. We can bound (3.35) with

$$\sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{n_2 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq r \leq n_2} 2^{-j/2} \int_{A_1} g_j \chi_2 \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_{n_2+1-r} 2^{(n_2+1-r)(1-\epsilon_0)} \phi_{1,j_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1) \frac{\chi_2 \phi_{2,j_2,n_2}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2)}{(\frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|})^{1-\epsilon_0}}.$$

We now use the fact that $|\xi_2| \leq 2$ and again the Strichartz inequality (2.19) to continue with

$$\sum_{j, j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{n_2 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq r \leq n_2} 2^{-j/2} \|g_j \chi_2 \chi_j \theta_{n_2+1-r}\|_{L^2} 2^{-r(1-\epsilon_0)} 2^{j_1/2} \|\phi_{1,j_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\chi_2 \phi_{2,j_2,n_2}\|_{L^2}$$

and this is enough to prove the theorem in this case.

Case B2: $|\mu_1| \geq |\mu_2|$.

This case can be treated like Case B1 by replacing the role of (ξ_2, μ_2) by (ξ_1, μ_1) .

Region A_2 .

Case A: $|\xi| \geq \frac{1}{2}|\mu|/|\xi|$.

Here (3.33) becomes

$$(3.36) \quad \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{m \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int_{A_2} g_j \chi_1 \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_m(\xi) |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{2-\epsilon_0} \\ \frac{\phi_{1,j_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1)}{\max(1, |\xi_1|, \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|})^{1-\epsilon_0}} \frac{\phi_{2,j_2}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2)}{\max(1, |\xi_2|, \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|})^{1-\epsilon_0}}.$$

We dyadically decompose $|\xi_1| \sim |\xi_2| \sim 2^{m_1}$. Then $1 + |\xi| \sim 2^m$, with $m = m_1 + 1 - r$, $0 \leq r \leq m_1$ and

$$(3.36) \lesssim \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq r \leq m_1} 2^{-j/2} \int_{A_2} g_j \chi_1 \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_{m_1+1-r}(\xi) |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{2-\epsilon_0} \\ \frac{\phi_{1,j_1,m_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1)}{2^{m_1(1-\epsilon_0)}} \frac{\phi_{2,j_2,m_1}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2)}{2^{m_1(1-\epsilon_0)}} \\ \lesssim \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq r \leq m_1} 2^{-j/2} \int_{A_2} g_j \chi_1 \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_{m_1+1-r}(\xi) 2^{-r(2-2\epsilon_0)} \\ |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{\epsilon_0} \Pi_{i=1,2} \phi_{i,j_1,m_i}(\xi_i, \mu_i, \tau_i).$$

We apply Lemma 3.1 relative to the region A_2 and we continue with

$$\lesssim \sup_{j,m} \|g_j \chi_1 \chi_j \theta_m\|_{L^2} \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq r \leq m_1} 2^{-r(2-2\epsilon_0)} \Pi_{i=1,2} \sum_{j_i \geq 0} 2^{j_i/2} \|\phi_{i,j_i,m_1}\|_{L^2} \\ \lesssim \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{j_1/2} 2^{j_2/2} \left(\sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \|\phi_{1,j_1,m_1}\|_{L^2} \|\phi_{2,j_2,m_1}\|_{L^2} \right) \\ \lesssim \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{j_1/2} 2^{j_2/2} \left(\sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \|\phi_{1,j_1,m_1}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \|\phi_{2,j_2,m_1}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \lesssim \left(\sum_{j_1 \geq 0} 2^{j_1/2} \|\phi_{1,j_1}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{j_2 \geq 0} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{2,j_2}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which concludes the argument.

Case B: $|\xi| < \frac{1}{2}|\mu|/|\xi|$.

If $\frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|} \leq 1$ it follows that $|\xi| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and hence $|\mu| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and we go back to the same estimates presented for region A_1 . So we can assume $\frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|} \geq 1$. We have to estimate (3.35) where now the integral takes place in A_2 . Again we consider two subcases.

Case B1: $|\mu_1| \leq |\mu_2|$.

If $\frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|} \leq |\xi_2|$ then $|\mu_2| \leq 2|\xi_2|^2$, $|\mu_1 + \mu_2| \leq 4|\xi_2|^2$. We dyadically decompose with respect

to $|\xi_1| \sim |\xi_2| \sim 2^{m_2}$, so that $1 + |\mu_1 + \mu_2| \sim 2^{-r+2m_2}$, $0 \leq r \leq 2m_2$. Then in this case we bound (3.34) with

$$\sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{m_2 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq r \leq 2m_2} 2^{-j/2} \int_{A_2} g_j \chi_2 \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_{2m_2+1-r}(\mu) 2^{-r(1-\epsilon_0)} |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{\epsilon_0} \Pi_{i=1,2} \phi_{i,j_i,m_2}(\xi_i, \mu_i, \tau_i).$$

and one can use again Lemma 3.1 in region A_2 as above. If $\frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|} > |\xi_2|$ we introduce a dyadic decomposition with respect to μ_2 and we set $|\mu_2| \sim 2^{n_2}$. Then $|\mu_1 + \mu_2| \leq C|\mu_2| \leq C2^{n_2}$ and we can write $1 + |\mu_1 + \mu_2| \sim 2^{n_2+1-r}$, $0 \leq r \leq n_2$. We then bound (3.34) with

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{n_2 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq r \leq n_2} 2^{-j/2} \int_{A_2} g_j \chi_2 \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_{n_2+1-r} 2^{(n_2+1-r)(1-\epsilon_0)} \\ & \times |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{\epsilon_0} \frac{\phi_{1,j_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1)}{|\xi_1|^{1-\epsilon_0}} \frac{\chi_2 \phi_{2,j_2,n_2}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2)}{(\frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|})^{1-\epsilon_0}} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{n_2 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq r \leq n_2} \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int_{A_2} g_j \chi_2 \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_{n_2+1-r} 2^{-r(1-\epsilon_0)} \\ & \times |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{\epsilon_0} \phi_{1,j_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1) \chi_2 \phi_{2,j_2,n_2}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2) \end{aligned}$$

We use again Lemma 3.1 and we continue with

$$\sup_{j,n} \|g_j \chi_2 \chi_j \theta_n\|_{L^2} \sum_{n_2 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq r \leq n_2} 2^{-r(1-\epsilon_0)} \left(\sum_{j_1 \geq 0} 2^{j_1/2} \|\phi_{1,j_1}\|_{L^2} \right) \left(\sum_{j_2 \geq 0} 2^{j_2/2} \|\chi_2 \phi_{2,n_2,j_2}\|_{L^2} \right)$$

and this is enough to prove the theorem in this case.

Case B2: $|\mu_1| \geq |\mu_2|$. One can use the same argument presented for Case B1 inverting the role of (ξ_1, μ_1) and (ξ_2, μ_2) .

Region $A_3 \cup A_4 \cup (A_5 - \tilde{A}_5(\epsilon_0))$.

Case A: $\frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|} \leq |\xi|$.

We consider two subcases.

Case A1: $|\xi_1| \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}$. We dyadically decompose with respect to $|\xi| \sim |\xi_1| \sim 2^{m_1}$ and we bound (3.33), now integrated over the region $A = A_3 \cup A_4 \cup (A_5 - \tilde{A}_5(\epsilon_0))$, with

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int_A g_j \chi_1 \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_{m_1}(\xi) |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{2-\epsilon_0} \\ & \frac{\chi_2 \phi_{1,j_1,m_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1)}{|\xi_1|^{1-\epsilon_0}} \frac{\phi_{2,j_2}}{(\frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|})^{1-\epsilon_0}}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2). \end{aligned}$$

But in this region $\frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|} \gtrsim |\xi_1| \sim |\xi_1 + \xi_2|$, hence we can continue with

$$(3.37) \quad \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int_A g_j \chi_1 \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_{m_1}(\xi) |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{\epsilon_0} \chi_1 \phi_{1,j_1,m_1} \phi_{2,j_2}$$

We then apply Lemma 3.1 and we obtain the desired result.

Case A2: $|\xi_1| \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}$.

We do a dyadic decomposition of ϕ_2 in (μ_2/ξ_2) , so that we write $\phi_2 = \sum_{r_2 \geq 0} \tilde{\phi}_{2,r_2} = \sum_{r_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j_2 \geq 0} \tilde{\phi}_{2,r_2,j_2}$, where $1 + |\mu_2|/|\xi_2| \sim 2^{r_2}$ and $1 + |\tau_2 - \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2)| \sim 2^{j_2}$. Note that $|\xi_1| \leq C \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \leq C \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|}$, and that if $|\xi_1| \sim 2^{m_1}$, then $2^{r_2} \sim 2^{m_1+r}$, $r \leq -C$. We bound (3.33) with

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{r \geq -C} 2^{-j/2} \int_A g_j \chi_1 \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_{m_1}(\xi) \\
 & |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{2-\epsilon_0} \frac{\chi_2 \phi_{1,j_1,m_1}}{|\xi_1|^{1-\epsilon_0}}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1) \frac{\tilde{\phi}_{2,m_1+r,j_2}}{(\frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|})^{1-\epsilon_0}}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2) \\
 (3.38) \quad & \lesssim \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{-C \leq r} 2^{-j/2} 2^{-r(1-\epsilon_0)} \int_A g_j \chi_1 \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_{m_1}(\xi) \\
 & |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{\epsilon_0} \chi_2 \phi_{1,j_1,m_1} \tilde{\phi}_{2,m_1+r,j_2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

If we use again Lemma 3.1 we can continue the chain of inequalities with

$$\sup_{j, m_1} \|g_j \chi_1 \chi_j \theta_{m_1}\|_{L^2} \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{-C \leq r} 2^{-r(1-\epsilon_0)} \sum_{j_1 \geq 0} 2^{j_1/2} \|\chi_2 \phi_{1,j_1,m_1}\|_{L^2} \sum_{j_2 \geq 0} 2^{j_2/2} \|\tilde{\phi}_{2,m_1+r,j_2}\|_{L^2}.$$

Now Cauchy-Schwarz in m_1 is enough to obtain Theorem 3 in this case.

Case B: $\frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|} > |\xi|$. As we observed in the analysis of region $A_i, i = 1, 2$, without loss of generality we can assume that $\frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|} \geq 1$. We consider two subcases.

Case B1: $|\mu_1| \leq |\mu_2|$.

We recall that in this region we also have $\frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|} \gg |\xi_2|$. We repeat the argument presented in the second part of Case B1 of region A_2 .

Case B2: $|\mu_1| \geq |\mu_2|$.

If $\frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \leq |\xi_1|$ then we use an argument similar to the one in the first part of Case B1 in region A_2 , where the role of (ξ_2, μ_2) is now played by (ξ_1, μ_1) . In particular, if $|\xi_1| \sim 2^{m_1}$, since $|\mu_2|/|\xi_2| \gtrsim |\xi_1|$ and $|\xi_1 + \xi_3| \sim |\xi_1|$, we can bound (3.35) with

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int_A g_j \chi_s \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{\epsilon_0} \\
 & \times \frac{|\mu_1 + \mu_2|^{1-\epsilon_0}}{2^{2(1-\epsilon_0)m_1}} \theta_{m_1}(\xi_1) \phi_{1,j_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1) \phi_{2,j_2}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2).
 \end{aligned}$$

But, $|\mu_1 + \mu_2| \leq 2|\mu_1| \lesssim \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} |\xi_1| \lesssim |\xi_1|^2$, so that

$$(1 + |\mu_1 + \mu_2|) \sim 2^{2m_1-r+1}, 0 \leq r \leq 2m_1,$$

so we can continue with

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq r \leq 2m_1} 2^{-j/2} \int_A g_j \chi_2 \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_{2m_1+1-r}(\mu) \\
 & \times 2^{-r(1-\epsilon_0)} |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{\epsilon_0} \chi_1 \phi_{1,j_1,m_1} \phi_{2,j_2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

We then use Lemma 3.1. If $\frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \geq |\xi_1|$, we dyadically decompose so that $|\mu_1| \sim 2^{n_1}$. Then $|\mu_1 + \mu_2| \sim 2^{n_1+1-r}$, $0 \leq r \leq n_1$. We bound (3.35) with

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{j \geq 1} \sum_{n_1 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq r \leq n_1} 2^{-j/2} \int_A g_j \chi_2 \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_{n_1+1-r} 2^{(n_1+1-r)(1-\epsilon_0)} \\
 & \quad \times |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{\epsilon_0} \frac{\chi_2 \phi_{1,n_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1)}{\left(\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}\right)^{1-\epsilon_0}} \frac{\phi_2(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2)}{\left(\frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|}\right)^{1-\epsilon_0}} \\
 & \lesssim \sum_{n_1 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq r \leq n_1} \sum_{j \geq 1} 2^{-j/2} \int_A g_j \chi_2 \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_{n_1+1-r} 2^{-r(1-\epsilon_0)} \\
 & \quad \times |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{\epsilon_0} 2^{n_1(1-\epsilon_0)} \frac{\chi_2 \phi_{1,n_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1)}{\left(\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}\right)^{1-\epsilon_0}} \frac{\phi_2(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2)}{|\xi_1|^{1-\epsilon_0}} \\
 & \lesssim \sum_{n_1 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq r \leq n_1} \sum_{j \geq 1} 2^{-j/2} \int_A g_j \chi_2 \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_{n_1+1-r} 2^{-r(1-\epsilon_0)} |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{\epsilon_0} \chi_2 \phi_{1,n_1} \phi_2
 \end{aligned}$$

Now again one uses Lemma 3.1 to conclude the argument.

Region $A_5 \cap \tilde{A}_5(\epsilon_0)$. We summarize the restrictions that occur in this region: for $\alpha > 4$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3.40) \quad & |\xi_2| \leq 1, \quad \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \lesssim \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|}, \quad |\mu_1/\xi_1 - \mu_2/\xi_2| \lesssim |\xi_1 + \xi_2| \\
 & |\xi_1|^{1+\alpha\epsilon_0} \leq \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}, \quad \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \geq 100|\xi_1|.
 \end{aligned}$$

In this case, $A = A^* \cap A_5 \cap \tilde{A}_5(\epsilon_0)$.

Case A: $|\xi| \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}$.

We dyadically decompose with respect to ξ , so that $|\xi| \sim |\xi_1| \sim 2^m$. We write

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{m \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int_A g_j \chi_1 \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_m(\xi) |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{2-\epsilon_0} \\
 & \quad \times \frac{\phi_{1,j_1,m}}{\left(\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}\right)^{1-\epsilon_0}}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1) \frac{\phi_{2,j_2}}{\left(\frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|}\right)^{1-\epsilon_0}}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2).
 \end{aligned}$$

Now let's consider the multiplier in the above integral. Using (3.40) (with $\alpha > 4$) we can write

$$(3.41) \quad \frac{|\xi_1|^{2-\epsilon_0}}{\left(\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}\right)^{2-2\epsilon_0}} \lesssim \frac{|\xi_1|^{1-2\epsilon_0}}{\left(\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}\right)^{1-2\epsilon_0}} \lesssim |\xi_1|^{-\alpha\epsilon_0(1-2\epsilon_0)}.$$

Using (3.41) and Strichartz inequality (2.19) we can continue the chain of inequalities with

$$\lesssim \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \sum_{m \geq 0} \|g_j \theta_m \chi_1 \chi_j\|_{L^2} 2^{-\alpha\epsilon_0(1-2\epsilon_0)m} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{j_1/2} \|\phi_{1,m,j_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{2,j_2}\|_{L^2}$$

and Cauchy-Schwarz in m is enough to prove the theorem in this case.

Case B: $|\xi| < \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}$.

From (3.40) we have that

$$(3.42) \quad \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \sim \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|},$$

hence $|\mu_2| \sim |\xi_2| \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \ll |\mu_1|$, hence $|\mu_1 + \mu_2| \sim |\mu_1|$. We dyadically decompose with respect to $|\mu_1| \sim 2^{n_1}$. We have to estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{n_1 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int_A g_j \chi_2 \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_{n_1}(\mu) |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{\epsilon_0} |\mu_1 + \mu_2|^{1-\epsilon_0} \\ & \times \frac{\chi_2 \phi_{1, n_1, j_1}}{(\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|})^{1-\epsilon_0}}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1) \frac{\phi_{2, j_2}}{(\frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|})^{1-\epsilon_0}}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2). \end{aligned}$$

Now let's consider the multiplier in this integral. Using (3.40) we can write

$$\frac{|\xi_1| (\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|})^{1-\epsilon_0}}{(\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|})^{2-2\epsilon_0}} \lesssim \frac{(\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|})^{1/(1+\alpha\epsilon_0)}}{(\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|})^{1-\epsilon_0}} \lesssim 1,$$

provided $\epsilon_0 < (\alpha - 1)/\alpha$. Then using Strichartz we can continue the chain of inequality with

$$\lesssim \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \sum_{n_1 \geq 0} \|g_j \theta_{n_1} \chi_2 \chi_j\|_{L^2} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{j_1/2} \|\chi_2 \phi_{1, n_1, j_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{2, j_2}\|_{L^2},$$

and the theorem is proved also in this case.

Region A_6 . Of the whole theorem this is the region in which the estimates are the most delicate. We summarize the restrictions on this region:

$$(3.43) \quad \begin{aligned} |\xi_1| &\geq 1, \quad |\xi_2| \leq 10^{-10} |\xi_1| \\ \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|} &\leq 10^{-10} \max(|\xi_1|, \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}). \end{aligned}$$

We observe that the multipliers appearing in (3.33) and (3.34) can be bounded in the following way:

$$(3.44) \quad \frac{|\xi| \max(1, |\xi|, \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^{1-\epsilon_0}}{\max(1, |\xi_1|, \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|})^{1-\epsilon_0} \max(1, |\xi_2|, \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|})^{1-\epsilon_0}} \lesssim \frac{|\xi_1|}{\max(1, |\xi_2|, \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|})^{1-\epsilon_0}}$$

This is obvious when $|\xi| \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}$ or when $|\xi| \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}$ and $\frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|} \leq 1$. In the remaining region we estimate the numerator

$$\begin{aligned} |\xi| \max(1, |\xi|, \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^{1-\epsilon_0} &\sim |\xi_1|^{\epsilon_0} |\mu_1 + \mu_2|^{1-\epsilon_0} \\ &\lesssim |\xi_1|^{\epsilon_0} |\mu_1|^{1-\epsilon_0} + |\xi_1|^{\epsilon_0} |\mu_2|^{1-\epsilon_0} \\ &\lesssim |\xi_1|^{\epsilon_0} |\xi_1|^{1-\epsilon_0} (\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|})^{1-\epsilon_0} + |\xi_1|^{\epsilon_0} |\xi_2|^{1-\epsilon_0} (\frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|})^{1-\epsilon_0} \\ &\lesssim |\xi_1| ((\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|})^{1-\epsilon_0} + \max(|\xi_1|, \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|})^{1-\epsilon_0}). \end{aligned}$$

Case A: $|\xi_1| \geq 10^2 \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}$.

Let's show that in this case we also have $|\xi| \geq \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|} &\leq (1 - 10^{-10})^{-1} \frac{|\mu_1 + \mu_2|}{|\xi_1|} \leq (1 - 10^{-10})^{-1} \left(\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} + \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|} \frac{|\xi_2|}{|\xi_1|} \right) \\ &\leq (1 - 10^{-10})^{-1} \left(\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} + 10^{-20} |\xi_1| \right) \leq (1 - 10^{-10})^{-1} (10^{-2} + 10^{-20}) |\xi_1| \\ &\leq (1 - 10^{-10})^{-2} (10^{-2} + 10^{-20}) |\xi_1 + \xi_2| \leq |\xi|. \end{aligned}$$

We have to estimate (3.33) and we use again the functions ϕ_{i,j_i} . We change variables in τ_1 and τ_2 as in (3.17) and we use (3.44) to bound (3.33) with

$$\begin{aligned} (3.45) \quad &\sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{m \geq 0} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int \chi_1 \theta_{m_1} g_j(\xi_1 + \xi_2, \mu_1 + \mu_2, \theta_1 + \omega(\xi_1, \mu_1) + \theta_2 + \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2)) \\ &\chi_j(\theta_1 + \omega(\xi_1, \mu_1) + \theta_2 + \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2) - \omega(\xi_1 + \xi_2, \mu_1 + \mu_2)) \chi_1(\xi_1, \mu_1) \\ &\frac{|\xi_1|}{\max(1, |\xi_2|, \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|})^{1-\epsilon_0}} \Pi_{i=1,2} \phi_i(\xi_i, \mu_i, \theta_i + \omega(\xi_i, \mu_i)) \chi_{j_i}(\theta_i) d\xi_i d\mu_i d\tau_i. \end{aligned}$$

We change variables again and this time we use (3.20). From (3.21) we deduce that $|J_\mu| \geq C|\xi_1|^2$. We also perform a dyadic decompositions by setting $|\xi_i| \sim 2^{m_i}$ (hence $|\xi| \sim 2^{m_1}$) and $|\mu_2| \sim 2^{n_2}$. Let $m_2^* = \max(n_2 - m_2, m_2)$, (here $m_2, n_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$).

Case A1: $j \geq \max(0, m_2^*)$.

Denote with $H(u, v, w, \mu_2, \theta_1, \theta_2)$ the transformation of

$$\chi_1(\xi_1, \mu_1) \phi_1(\xi_1, \mu_1, \theta_1 + \omega(\xi_1, \mu_1)) \chi_{j_1}(\theta_1) \frac{\phi_2(\xi_2, \mu_2, \theta_2 + \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2)) \chi_{j_2}(\theta_2)}{\max(1, |\xi_2|, \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|})^{1-\epsilon_0}}$$

under the change of variables in (3.20). Here we use the fact that $\Delta_{\mu_2} \sim 2^{n_2}$. Then we can rewrite (3.45) as

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{m_1 \geq 0, m_2} \sum_{n_2} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq \max(0, m_2^*)} 2^{-j/2} 2^{m_1} \int g_j \theta_{m_1} \chi_1 \chi_j(u, v, w) \\ &|J_\mu|^{-1} H(u, v, w, \mu_2, \theta_1, \theta_2) du dv dw d\mu_2 d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \\ &\lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0, m_2} \sum_{n_2} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq \max(0, m_2^*)} 2^{-j/2} 2^{m_1} 2^{n_2/2} \\ &\int g_j \theta_{m_1} \chi_1 \chi_j(u, v, w) \left(\int_{\mu_2} |J_\mu|^{-2} H^2(u, v, w, \mu_2, \theta_1, \theta_2) d\mu_2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} du dv dw d\theta_1 d\theta_2. \end{aligned}$$

Now we observe that by Cauchy-Schwarz and the inverse change of variable we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int g_j \theta_{m_1} \chi_1 \chi_j(u, v, w) \left(\int_{\mu_2} |J_\mu|^{-2} H^2(u, v, w, \mu_2, \theta_1, \theta_2) d\mu_2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} du dv dw d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \\ &\lesssim 2^{-m_1} \|g_j \chi_j \theta_{m_1} \chi_1\|_{L^2} 2^{j_1/2} \|\chi_1 \phi_{1,j_1,m_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/2} \frac{\|\phi_{2,j_2,m_2,n_2}\|_{L^2}}{\max(1, 2^{m_2^*})^{1-\epsilon_0}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\phi_{2,j_2,m_2,n_2} = \phi_{2,j_2,m_2}\theta_{n_2}$, and inserting this above we can continue with

$$(3.46) \quad \lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0, m_2} \sum_{n_2} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq \max(0, m_2^*)} 2^{-j/2} 2^{n_2/2} \\ \|g_j \chi_j \theta_{m_1} \chi_1\|_{L^2} 2^{j_1/2} \|\chi_1 \phi_{1,j_1,m_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/2} \frac{\|\phi_{2,j_2,m_2,n_2}\|_{L^2}}{\max(1, 2^{m_2^*})^{1-\epsilon_0}}.$$

Case A1a: $m_2 \leq 0$, $n_2 - m_2 > 0$.

Now $m_2^* = n_2 - m_2$ and (3.46) can be bounded by

$$\sum_{m_1 \geq 0, m_2 \leq 0} \sum_{n_2 \geq m_2} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq \max(0, m_2^*)} 2^{-j/2} 2^{n_2/2} 2^{(-n_2+m_2)(1-\epsilon_0)} \\ \|g_j \chi_j \theta_{m_1} \chi_1\|_{L^2} 2^{j_1/2} \|\chi_1 \phi_{1,j_1,m_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{2,j_2,m_2,n_2}\|_{L^2},$$

and if we sum for $j \geq n_2 - m_2$ we can continue our chain of inequalities with

$$\lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{n_2 \geq m_2, m_2 \leq 0} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{m_2/2} 2^{(-n_2+m_2)(1-\epsilon_0)} 2^{j_1/2} \|\chi_1 \phi_{1,j_1,m_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{2,j_2,m_2,n_2}\|_{L^2},$$

and by Cauchy-Schwarz on n_2 and $m_2 \leq 0$ we obtain

$$(3.47) \quad (3.33) \lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{j_1/2} \|\chi_1 \phi_{1,j_1,m_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{2,j_2}\|_{L^2}$$

and this proves the theorem in this case.

Case A1b: $m_2 \leq 0$, $n_2 - m_2 \leq 0$.

In this case $\max(1, 2^{m_2^*}) = 1$. We repeat the argument above and we bound (3.33) with

$$(3.48) \quad \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{n_2 \leq m_2 \leq 0} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j} 2^{-j/2} 2^{n_2/2} \\ \|g_j \chi_j \theta_{m_1} \chi_1\|_{L^2} 2^{j_1/2} \|\chi_1 \phi_{1,j_1,m_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{2,j_2,m_2,n_2}\|_{L^2}$$

and one obtains again (3.47) after summing in j and using Cauchy-Schwarz first in n_2 and then in m_2 .

Case A1c: $m_2 > 0$, $n_2 - m_2 \leq 0$.

In this case $m_2^* = m_2 > 0$. We obtain

$$(3.49) \quad (3.33) \lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{n_2 \leq m_2} \sum_{0 \leq m_2} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq m_2} 2^{-j/2} 2^{n_2/2} 2^{-m_2(1-\epsilon_0)} \\ \|g_j \chi_j \theta_{m_1} \chi_1\|_{L^2} 2^{j_1/2} \|\chi_1 \phi_{1,j_1,m_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{2,j_2,m_2,n_2}\|_{L^2}$$

and summing over j

$$\lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{n_2 \leq m_2} \sum_{0 \leq m_2} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{-m_2/2} 2^{n_2/2} 2^{-m_2(1-\epsilon_0)} 2^{j_1/2} \|\chi_1 \phi_{1,j_1,m_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{2,j_2,m_2,n_2}\|_{L^2}$$

and by Cauchy-Schwarz in n_2

$$\lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq m_2} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{-m_2(1-\epsilon_0)} 2^{j_1/2} \|\chi_1 \phi_{1,j_1,m_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{2,j_2,m_2}\|_{L^2}$$

and a final Cauchy-Schwarz in m_2 concludes the argument.

Case A1d: $m_2 > 0$, $n_2 - m_2 \geq 0$.

In this case it is easy to see that

$$(3.50) \quad 2^{n_2/2} 2^{-m_2^*} \leq 1.$$

Using the same type of estimates presented above, after summing on $j \geq m_2^* \geq 0$ we obtain

$$(3.33) \lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{n_2, m_2} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{-m_2^*(3/2 - \epsilon_0)} 2^{n_2/2} 2^{j_1/2} \|\chi_1 \phi_{1,j_1,m_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{2,j_2,m_2,n_2}\|_{L^2},$$

and after using (3.50) we can continue with

$$\lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{n_2, m_2} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{-m_2^*(\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon_0)} 2^{j_1/2} \|\chi_1 \phi_{1,j_1,m_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{2,j_2,m_2,n_2}\|_{L^2}.$$

If $n_2 - m_2 \geq m_2$ then

$$\lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{m_2 > 0} \sum_{n_2 \geq 2m_2} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{(-n_2+m_2)(\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon_0)} 2^{j_1/2} \|\chi_1 \phi_{1,j_1,m_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{2,j_2,m_2,n_2}\|_{L^2}.$$

and we conclude by Cauchy-Schwarz first with respect to n_2 and then m_2 , (here we assume $\epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{2}$). If $0 \leq n_2 - m_2 < m_2$, we have $m_2 \leq n_2 < 2m_2$,

$$\lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{m_2 \leq n_2 < 2m_2} \sum_{m_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{-m_2(\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon_0)} 2^{j_1/2} \|\chi_1 \phi_{1,j_1,m_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{2,j_2,m_2,n_2}\|_{L^2}.$$

and we proceed as in the previous case. This concludes the analysis of Case A1.

Case A2: $0 \leq j \leq m_2^*$.

Case A2a: $m_2 \geq 0$ or $m_2 < 0$ and $n_2 > 0$.

We claim that in this case $j \leq \max(j_1, j_2)$. Recall the fundamental identity (1.5). Then combining this with the restrictions of Case A, we conclude that $2^{2m_1+m_2} \lesssim 2^{\max(j, j_1, j_2)}$. If $j \geq \max(j_1, j_2)$, then $2^{2m_1+m_2} \lesssim 2^j$ and if $m_2 \geq 0$ this implies that $2^{2m_1} \leq \max(2^{m_2}, 2^{n_2-m_2})$, a contradiction if one compares this with (3.43). When $m_2 < 0$ and $n_2 \geq 0$, then $n_2 - m_2 \geq 0$ and we obtain $2^{2m_1} \lesssim 2^{n_2-2m_2} \lesssim 2^{2(n_2-m_2)}$, again a contradiction if one compares with (3.43). If we assume that $j_1 = \max(j_1, j_2)$, then $2^{2m_1+m_2} \lesssim 2^{j_1}$, that is

$$|\xi_1| \sim 2^{m_1} \lesssim 2^{j_1/2 - m_2/2}.$$

We can then bound (3.33) with

$$(3.51) \lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{n_2, m_2} \sum_{j \leq m_2^*} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} 2^{j_1/2 - m_2/2} \int \chi_j g_j \chi_1 \theta_{m_1} \chi_1 \phi_{1,j_1,m_1} 2^{-m_2^*(1-\epsilon_0)} \phi_{2,j_2,m_2,n_2}$$

We use the Strichartz inequality (2.19) for $\chi_j g_j \chi_1 \theta_{m_1}$ and for ϕ_{2,j_2,m_2,n_2} and Plancherel for ϕ_{1,j_1,m_1} and Hölder's inequality to continue the chain of inequalities with

$$\lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{n_2, m_2} \sum_{j \leq m_2^*} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{j_1/2 - m_2/2} 2^{-m_2^*(1-\epsilon_0)} \|\chi_1 \phi_{1,j_1,m_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{2,j_2,m_2,n_2}\|_{L^2}.$$

We now sum over j to get

$$(3.52) \lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{n_2, m_2} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} (1 + m_2^*) 2^{-m_2/2} 2^{-m_2^*(1-\epsilon_0)} 2^{j_1/2} \|\chi_1 \phi_{1,j_1,m_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{2,j_2,m_2,n_2}\|_{L^2}.$$

Now assume that $m_2 \geq 0$. We split the m_2 sum in (3.52) into $n_2 - m_2 > m_2$ and $n_2 - m_2 \leq m_2$. In the first case (3.52) becomes

$$\lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{n_2 \geq 2m_2} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} [1 + (n_2 - m_2)] 2^{-m_2/2} 2^{-(n_2 - m_2)(1 - \epsilon_0)} 2^{j_1/2} \|\chi_1 \phi_{1, j_1, m_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{2, j_2, m_2, n_2}\|_{L^2}.$$

We first use Cauchy-Schwarz on n_2 and then on m_2 to finish. In the second case $n_2 \leq 2m_2$ and $m_2^* = m_2$. In this case we go back to (3.51) and we sum with respect to n_2 . Then we use Strichartz inequality (2.19) in the order $L^4 L^2 L^4$ (as above) to get

$$\lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{m_2 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq m_2} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{-m_2/2} 2^{-m_2(1 - \epsilon_0)} 2^{j_1/2} \|\chi_1 \phi_{1, j_1, m_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{2, j_2, m_2}\|_{L^2}.$$

Summing in j and then using Cauchy-Schwarz in m_2 will prove the theorem also in this case⁸. Assume now that $m_2 < 0$ and $n_2 > 0$, hence $m_2^* = n_2 - m_2 \geq 0$. Then (3.52) becomes

$$\sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{n_2 \geq 0} \sum_{m_2 \leq 0} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} [1 + (n_2 - m_2)] 2^{-m_2/2} 2^{-(n_2 - m_2)(1 - \epsilon_0)} 2^{j_1/2} \|\chi_1 \phi_{1, j_1, m_1}\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{2, j_2, m_2, n_2}\|_{L^2}.$$

Observe that

$$2^{-m_2/2} (n_2 - m_2) 2^{-(n_2 - m_2)(1 - \epsilon_0)} \lesssim 2^{-(1 - \sigma)(1 - \epsilon_0)n_2} 2^{m_2(-\frac{1}{2} + (1 - \sigma)(1 - \epsilon_0))}$$

for some $0 < \sigma \ll 1$ and $\epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{2}$. This is enough for Cauchy-Schwarz with respect to n_2 and m_2 .

Case A2b: $m_2, n_2 \leq 0$

In this case $|\xi_2|, |\mu_2| \leq 1$. We bound (3.33) with

$$(3.53) \quad \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int_{|\xi_2|, |\mu_2| \leq 1} (|\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} g_j \theta_{m_1} \chi_1 \chi_j) \\ (|\xi_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} \chi_1 \phi_{1, j_1, m_1}) \frac{\phi_{2, j_2}}{\max(1, |\xi_2|, |\mu_2|/|\xi_2|)^{1 - \epsilon_0}}$$

If $|\mu_2|^2/|\xi_2| \lesssim 2^{j_2}$ then $|\omega(\xi_2, \mu_2)| \lesssim 2^{j_2}$ and because $|\tau_2 - \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2)| \sim 2^{j_2}$ we also have $|\tau_2| \lesssim 2^{j_2}$. We then apply Hölder's inequalities in the order $L_x^4 L_y^2 L_t^2 - L_x^4 L_y^2 L_t^2 - L_x^2 L_y^\infty L_t^\infty$ combined with (2.27) and (2.29) to continue the chain of inequalities in (3.53) with

$$\lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} 2^{j/4} \|g_j \theta_{m_1} \chi_1 \chi_j\|_{L^2} 2^{j_1/4} \|\phi_{1, j_1, m_1} \chi_1\|_{L^2} 2^{j_2/2} \|\phi_{2, j_2}\|_{L^2}$$

⁸Observe that if $j_2 = \max(j_1, j_2)$ one does the same analysis by applying Strichartz inequality (2.19) in the order $L^4 L^4 L^2$.

and in this case we are done. Assume now that $|\mu_2|^2/|\xi_2| \gg 2^{j_2}$. Then $|\tau_2| \sim |\mu_2|^2/|\xi_2|$ and we can rewrite (3.53) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int (|\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} g_j \theta_{m_1} \chi_1 \chi_j) (|\xi_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} \phi_{1, j_1, m_1} \chi_1) \frac{\phi_{2, j_2} |\mu_2|^{1-\epsilon_0}}{(|\mu_2|^2/|\xi_2|)^{1-\epsilon_0}} \\ & \sim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int (|\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} g_j \theta_{m_1} \chi_1 \chi_j) (|\xi_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} \phi_{1, j_1, m_1} \chi_1) \frac{\phi_{2, j_2} |\mu_2|^{1-\epsilon_0}}{|\tau_2|^{1-\epsilon_0}} \\ & \sim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2+j/4} \|g_j \theta_{m_1} \chi_1\|_{L^2} 2^{j_1/4} \|\phi_{1, j_1, m_1} \chi_1\|_{L^2} \|\phi_{2, j_2}\|_{L^2} \end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used again the fact that $|\mu_2| \leq 1$, $\epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{2}$, Hölder's inequality in the order $L_x^4 L_y^2 L_t^2 - L_x^4 L_y^2 L_t^2 - L_x^2 L_y^\infty L_t^\infty$ and (2.27) and (2.29). This concludes the analysis of Case A.

Case B: $|\xi_1| \leq 10^{-2} \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}$.

Using (3.43) one can prove that $|\mu_1 + \mu_2|/|\xi_1 + \xi_2| \geq 2|\xi_1 + \xi_2|$, that $|\mu_1 + \mu_2|/|\xi_1 + \xi_2| \sim |\mu_1|/|\xi_1|$, and that $|\mu_1 + \mu_2| \sim |\mu_1|$. We dyadically decompose $|\mu_1 + \mu_2| \sim |\mu_1| \sim 2^{n_1}$ and we write (3.34) as follows

$$(3.54) \quad \sum_{0 \leq j} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{n_1 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int |\xi_1| g_j \theta_{n_1} (\mu_1 + \mu_2) \chi_2 \chi_j \phi_{1, j_1, n_1} \chi_2 \frac{\phi_{2, j_2}}{\max(1, |\xi_2|, |\mu_2|/|\xi_2|)^{1-\epsilon_0}}.$$

We dyadically decompose also $|\xi_2| \sim 2^{m_2}$ and $|\mu_2| \sim 2^{n_2}$. As in Case A, we define $m_2^* = \max(n_2 - m_2, m_2)$ and we analyze two subcases.

Case B1: $j \geq \max(0, m_2^*)$.

We use the change of variable (3.20). Now $|J_\mu| \gtrsim (\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|})^2 \gtrsim |\xi_1|^2$. Then we proceed like in Case A1 above, where the sum in m_1 is replaced by a sum in n_1 .

Case B2: $0 \leq j \leq m_2^*$.

We again consider the two subcases $m_2 \geq 0$ or $m_2 < 0$ and $n_2 \geq 0$, and $m_2 < 0$ and $n_2 < 0$.

Case B2a: $m_2 \geq 0$ or $m_2 < 0$ and $n_2 > 0$.

The fundamental identity (1.5) now gives

$$\left(\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}\right)^2 |\xi_2| \leq \left(\frac{1}{2} - 10^{-10}\right)^{-1} 2^{\max(j_1, j_2, j)}.$$

This again forces $j \leq \max(j_1, j_2)$. In fact after setting $C = (\frac{1}{2} - 10^{-10})^{-1}$, if $j > \max(j_1, j_2)$ and $m_2 \geq 0$, then $(\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|})^2 \leq C 2^{\max(n_2 - m_2, m_2)}$ and so $(\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|})^2 \leq C \max(\frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|}, |\xi_2|)$ which is a contradiction in this region. If $m_2 < 0$ and $n_2 \geq 0$, then $(\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|})^2 |\xi_2| \leq C 2^{n_2 - m_2}$ or $(\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|})^2 \leq C 2^{n_2 - 2m_2} \leq C (\frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|})^2$, which is again a contradiction. Thus (if for example $j_2 \leq j_1$)

$$|\xi_1| \leq C \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \leq 10^{-2} 2^{j_1/2} 2^{-m_2/2},$$

and (3.54) can be bounded by

$$(3.55) \quad \sum_{j \leq m_2^*} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{n_1 \geq 0} \sum_{n_2, m_2} 2^{-j/2} 2^{j_1/2 - m_2/2} \int \chi_2 \chi_j g_{j, n_1} \theta_{n_1} \phi_{1, j_1, n_1} \chi_2 2^{-m_2^*(1-\epsilon_0)} \phi_{2, j_2, m_2, n_2}.$$

At this point we argue like in Case A2a by replacing (3.51) with (3.55).

Case B2b: $n_2, m_2 \leq 0$.

This case can be treated like Case A2b by replacing (3.53) with

$$(3.56) \quad \sum_{n_1 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int_{|\xi_2|, |\mu_1| \leq 1} (|\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} g_j \theta_{n_1} \chi_2 \chi_j) \\ (|\xi_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} \chi_2 \phi_{1, j_1, n_1}) \frac{\phi_{2, j_2}}{\max(1, |\xi_2|, |\mu_2|/|\xi_2|)^{1-\epsilon_0}}.$$

Case C: $10^{-2} \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \leq |\xi_1| \leq 10^2 \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}$.

It is easy to show that in this case $|\mu_1 + \mu_2|/|\xi_1 + \xi_2| \lesssim |\xi_1 + \xi_2|$. We dyadically decompose with respect to $|\xi_1| \sim |\xi_1 + \xi_2| \sim 2^{m_1}$. We go back to (3.45) and we consider two subcases: when $j > m_1$ and when $j \leq m_1$.

Case C1: $j > m_1$.

In this case we use the change of variable (3.23), where now the free variable is ξ_2 instead of ξ_1 . It is easy to check that also in this case (3.24) holds true and in particular $|J_\xi| \gtrsim \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \gtrsim |\xi_1|$. We perform a dyadic decomposition in ξ_2 , but only for large frequencies, that is for $|\xi_2| \geq 1$. Then (3.33) becomes

$$\sum_{m_1, m_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j > m_1} 2^{-j/2} 2^{m_1} \int \chi_1 g_j \theta_{m_1} \chi_j(u, v, w) \\ \times |J_\xi|^{-1} H(u, v, w, \xi_2, \theta_1, \theta_2) du dv dw d\xi_2 d\theta_1 d\theta_2,$$

where $H(u, v, w, \xi_2, \theta_1, \theta_2)$ is the transformation of

$$\chi_1 \phi_{1, m_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \theta_1 + \omega(\xi_1, \mu_1)) \chi_{j_1} \frac{\phi_{2, m_2}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \theta_2 + \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2)) \chi_2 \chi_{j_2}}{\max(1, |\xi_2|, \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|})^{1-\epsilon_0}}$$

under the above change of variables. We first use Cauchy-Schwarz in (u, v, w) to obtain

$$\lesssim \sum_{m_1, m_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j > m_1} 2^{-j/2} 2^{m_1} \|g_j \theta_{m_1} \chi_1\|_{L^2} \\ \times \left(\int (|J_\xi|^{-2} H^2(u, v, w, \xi_2, \theta_1, \theta_2) du dv dw)^{\frac{1}{2}} d\xi_2 d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \right)$$

We now use the lower bound $|J_\xi| \gtrsim 2^{m_1}$, and Cauchy-Schwarz in $\xi_2, \theta_1, \theta_2$, to obtain

$$\lesssim \sum_{m_1, m_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j > m_1} 2^{-j/2} 2^{m_1/2} 2^{m_2/2} 2^{j_1/2} 2^{j_2/2} \\ \times \|g_j \theta_{m_1} \chi_1\|_{L^2} \left(\int H^2(u, v, w, \xi_2, \theta_1, \theta_2) |J_\xi|^{-1} du dv dw d\xi_2 d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

which, upon undoing the change of variables yields (since $\max(1, |\xi_2|, |\mu_2|/|\xi_2|) \geq 2^{m_2}$)

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim \sum_{m_1, m_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j > m_1} 2^{-j/2} 2^{m_1/2} 2^{m_2/2} 2^{j_1/2} 2^{j_2/2} \\ &\quad \times \|g_j \theta_{m_1} \chi_1\|_{L^2} \|\phi_{1, j_1, m_1} \chi_1\|_{L^2} \|\phi_{2, j_2, m_2}\|_{L^2} 2^{-m_2(1-\epsilon_0)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then a sum in j and Cauchy-Schwarz in m_2 gives the result.

Case C2: $j \leq m_1$.

Let's introduce the region

$$(3.57) \quad R = \{10^{-2} \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \leq |\xi_1| \leq 10^2 \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}\} \cap A_6$$

This is the region where we need to introduce the space $Y_{1-\epsilon_0, \epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}$. We go back to (3.5) and this time we keep $|\hat{v}|$ and we only normalize $|\hat{u}|$. Then (3.5) becomes

$$(3.58) \quad \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq m_1} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int_R \chi_1 \theta_{m_1} g_j(\xi_1 + \xi_2, \mu_1 + \mu_2, \theta_1 + \omega(\xi_1, \mu_1) + \theta_2 + \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2)) \\ \chi_1 \chi_j(\theta_1 + \omega(\xi_1, \mu_1) + \theta_2 + \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2) - \omega(\xi_1 + \xi_2, \mu_1 + \mu_2)) |\xi_1| \\ \chi_1 \chi_{j_1} \phi_{1, m_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \theta_1 + \omega(\xi_1, \mu_1)) \chi_{j_2} |\hat{v}|(\xi_2, \mu_2, \theta_2 + \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2)).$$

Define D_{m_1, m_2} to be the dyadic block such that $|\xi_i| \sim 2^{m_i}, i = 1, 2$. We observe that for fixed $(\xi_1, \xi_2, \mu_1, \theta_1, \theta_2)$, the set of μ_2 such that $(\xi_1, \xi_2, \mu_1, \mu_2, \theta_1, \theta_2) \in R \cap D_{m_1, m_2}$ and such that (3.18) is true, is a union of two symmetric intervals with length satisfying (3.22). Similarly, for fixed $(\xi_2, \mu_1, \mu_2, \theta_1, \theta_2)$ the set of ξ_1 such that $(\xi_1, \xi_2, \mu_1, \mu_2, \theta_1, \theta_2) \in R \cap D_{m_1, m_2}$ and such that (3.18) is true, is a union of two symmetric intervals with length satisfying

$$(3.59) \quad |\Delta_{\xi_1}| \lesssim 2^{j-m_1-m_2}.$$

To prove this it's enough to use the mean value theorem, and estimate from below $|g'(\xi_1)|$, where

$$g(\xi_1) = \theta_1 + \theta_2 + \frac{\xi_1 \xi_2}{(\xi_1 + \xi_2)} \left(\left(\frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} - \frac{\mu_2}{\xi_2} \right)^2 - 3(\xi_1 + \xi_2)^2 \right).$$

After a short calculation one has

$$g'(\xi_1) = \frac{\xi_2^2}{(\xi_1 + \xi_2)^2} \left(\left(\frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} - \frac{\mu_2}{\xi_2} \right)^2 - 3(\xi_1 + \xi_2)^2 \right) - \xi_2 \left(\frac{2\mu_1}{\xi_1(\xi_1 + \xi_2)} \left(\frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} - \frac{\mu_2}{\xi_2} \right) + 6\xi_1 \right).$$

Note that in R

$$\left| \frac{\xi_2^2}{(\xi_1 + \xi_2)^2} \left(\left(\frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} - \frac{\mu_2}{\xi_2} \right)^2 - 3(\xi_1 + \xi_2)^2 \right) \right| \leq C \frac{|\xi_2|^2}{|\xi_1|^2} \left(\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \right)^2 \leq C 10^{-10} |\xi_2|^2.$$

On the other hand it's easy to check that ξ_1 and $\frac{2\mu_1}{\xi_1(\xi_1 + \xi_2)} \left(\frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} - \frac{\mu_2}{\xi_2} \right)$ have the same sign, hence

$$\left| \xi_2 \left(\frac{2\mu_1}{\xi_1(\xi_1 + \xi_2)} \left(\frac{\mu_1}{\xi_1} - \frac{\mu_2}{\xi_2} \right) + 6\xi_1 \right) \right| \geq 6|\xi_2|\xi_1$$

and the claim follows.

Case C2a: $m_2 \geq 0$

In this case we use the change of variables (3.23), and by (3.24), $|J_\xi| \gtrsim 2^{m_1}$. We can write (3.58) as

$$\sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq m_1} \sum_{m_2, j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} 2^{m_1} \int \chi_1 \chi_j g_{j, m_1}(u, v, w) |J_\xi|^{-1} H(u, v, w, \xi_1, \theta_1, \theta_2) du dv dw d\xi_1 d\theta_1 d\theta_2,$$

where $H(u, v, w, \xi_1, \theta_1, \theta_2)$ is the transformation of

$$\chi_j \chi_1 \chi_{j_1} \phi_{1, m_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \theta_1 + \omega(\xi_1, \mu_1)) \chi_{j_2} |\hat{v}|(\xi_2, \mu_2, \theta_2 + \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2)) \theta_{m_2}(\xi_2)$$

under the above change of variables. We will define

$$\hat{v}_{j_2, m_2}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2) = \chi_{j_2}(\tau_2 - \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2)) \hat{v}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2) \theta_{m_2}(\xi_2).$$

We can then continue the estimate with

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq m_1} \sum_{m_2, j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} 2^{m_1/2} 2^{(j-m_1-m_2)/2} \int \chi_j \chi_1 g_{j, m_1}(u, v, w) \\ &\quad \left(\int H^2(u, v, w, \xi_1, \theta_1, \theta_2) |J_\xi|^{-1} d\xi_1 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} du dv dw d\theta_1 d\theta_2 \\ &\lesssim \sum_{0 \leq j \leq m_1} \sum_{m_2, m_1, j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} 2^{m_1/2} 2^{(j-m_1-m_2)/2} \|g_j \theta_{m_1} \chi_j \chi_1\|_{L^2} 2^{j_1/2} 2^{j_2/2} \\ &\quad \left(\int |\chi_1 \phi_{m_1, j_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \theta_1 + \omega(\xi_1, \mu_1))|^2 |\hat{v}_{m_2, j_2}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \theta_2 + \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2))|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. \chi_j(\theta_1 + \omega(\xi_1, \mu_1) + \theta_2 + \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2) - \omega(\xi_1 + \xi_2, \mu_1 + \mu_2)) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

We now use Hölder inequality in μ_2 and Lemma 2.3. More precisely set $w(\xi, \mu) = (1 + |\xi| + \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})$, then we write, for $\theta = (p-2)/2p$, $p = 2r$, $r > 1$, $1 = \frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{r'}$,

$$(3.60) \quad \int |\hat{v}_{m_2, j_2}|^2 \chi_j \leq |\Delta_{\mu_2}|^{1/r'} \|\hat{v}_{m_2, j_2}\|_{L^{2r}}^2 \lesssim 2^{(j-m_1)/r'} \|w^{\epsilon_0} \hat{v}_{m_2, j_2}\|_{L^2}^{2(1-\theta)} \|w^{-\epsilon_0} \partial_{\mu_2} \hat{v}_{m_2, j_2}\|_{L^2}^{2\theta}.$$

We insert this in the chain of inequalities above and we continue with

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq m_1} \sum_{m_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} 2^{m_1/2} 2^{(j-m_1-m_2)/2} 2^{j_1/2} 2^{j_2/2} 2^{(j-m_1)/2r'} \|g_j \theta_{m_1} \chi_1 \chi_j\|_{L^2} \|\chi_1 \phi_{m_1, j_1}\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad \left(\int \|w^{\epsilon_0} \hat{v}_{m_2, j_2}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \theta_2 + \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2))\|_{L_{\mu_2}^2}^{2(1-\theta)} \|w^{-\epsilon_0} \partial_{\mu_2} \hat{v}_{m_2, j_2}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \theta_2 + \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2))\|_{L_{\mu_2}^2}^{2\theta} d\xi_2 d\theta_2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

and after applying Hölder's inequality with respect to ξ_2, θ_2 with exponents θ^{-1} and $(1-\theta)^{-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq m_1} \sum_{m_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} 2^{m_1/2} 2^{(j-m_1-m_2)/2} 2^{j_1/2} 2^{j_2/2} 2^{(j-m_1)/2r'} \|g_j \theta_{m_1} \chi_1 \chi_j\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad \|\chi_1 \phi_{m_1, j_1}\|_{L^2} \|w^{\epsilon_0} \hat{v}_{m_2, j_2}\|_{L^2}^{(1-\theta)} \|w^{-\epsilon_0} \partial_{\mu_2} \hat{v}_{m_2, j_2}\|_{L^2}^{\theta}. \end{aligned}$$

We first sum on $0 \leq j \leq m_1$, then on m_1 and j_1 so that the norm $\|u\|_{X_{1-\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}}$ appears. After Cauchy-Schwarz in m_2 we are left with the following term to estimate

$$\sum_{j_2 \geq 0} 2^{j_2/2} \left(\sum_{m_2 \geq 0} \|w^{\epsilon_0} \hat{v}_{m_2, j_2}\|_{L^2}^{2(1-\theta)} \|w^{-\epsilon_0} \partial_{\mu_2} \hat{v}_{m_2, j_2}\|_{L^2}^{2\theta} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We use a Hölder inequality with respect to the sum on m_2 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sum_{j_2 \geq 0} 2^{j_2/2} \left(\sum_{m_2 \geq 0} \|w^{\epsilon_0} \hat{v}_{m_2, j_2}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{(1-\theta)/2} \left(\sum_{m_2 \geq 0} \|w^{-\epsilon_0} \partial_{\mu_2} \hat{v}_{m_2, j_2}\|_{L^2}^2 \right)^{\theta/2} \\ &= \sum_{j_2 \geq 0} 2^{j_2/2} \|w^{\epsilon_0} \hat{v}_{j_2}\|_{L^2}^{(1-\theta)} \|w^{-\epsilon_0} \partial_{\mu_2} \hat{v}_{j_2}\|_{L^2}^{\theta}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\hat{v}_{j_2} = \sum_{m_2 \geq 0} \hat{v}_{j_2, m_2} = \chi_{j_2}(\tau - \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2)) \hat{v}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2).$$

then a Hölder inequality in j_2 to finish with

$$(3.61) \quad \left(\sum_{j_2 \geq 0} 2^{j_2/2} \|w^{\epsilon_0} \hat{v}_{j_2}\|_{L^2} \right)^{(1-\theta)} \left(\sum_{j_2 \geq 0} 2^{j_2/2} \|w^{-\epsilon_0} \partial_{\mu_2} \hat{v}_{j_2}\|_{L^2} \right)^{\theta}.$$

Clearly the first coefficient of (3.61) is controlled by $\|v\|_{X_{\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}}^{1-\theta}$. For the second one we write

$$\begin{aligned} &\partial_{\mu_2}(\hat{v}_{j_2}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \theta_2 + \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2))) = \partial_{\mu_2}(\chi_{j_2}(\theta_2) \hat{v}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \theta_2 + \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2))) \\ &= \chi_{j_2} \partial_{\mu_2} \hat{v}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \theta_2 + \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2)) + 2\mu_2 / \xi_2 \chi_{j_2} \partial_{\tau_2} \hat{v}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \theta_2 + \omega(\xi_2, \mu_2)) \end{aligned}$$

which shows that the second term is controlled by $\|v\|_{Y_{1-\epsilon_0, -\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}}^{\theta}$, with $\theta = (p-2)/2p$, $p = 2r$, $r > 1$.

Case C2b: $m_2 < 0$

If $j - m_1 \leq 2m_2$ we proceed like in Case C2a and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{m_2 < 0} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq m_1 + 2m_2} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} 2^{m_1/2} 2^{(j-m_1-m_2)/2} 2^{j_1/2} 2^{j_2/2} 2^{(j-m_1)/2r'} \|g_j \theta_{m_1} \chi_1 \chi_j\|_{L^2} \|\chi_1 \phi_{m_1, j_1}\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad \|w^{\epsilon_0} \hat{v}_{m_2, j_2}\|_{L^2}^{(1-\theta)} \|w^{-\epsilon_0} \partial_{\mu_2} \hat{v}_{m_2, j_2}\|_{L^2}^{\theta}. \end{aligned}$$

We sum on j , and then choose $r' < 2$ so that we can use the fact that $m_2 < 0$ and Cauchy-Schwarz in m_2 , to finish like in Case C2a. If $j - m_1 > 2m_2$ we use the change of variables (3.23), where we leave the variable ξ_2 free. It is easy to check that we have $|J_{\xi}| \gtrsim |\xi_1|$. Arguing as in Case C2a we are led to

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq m_1} \sum_{m_2 < (j-m_1)/2} \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} 2^{(m_1-j)/2} 2^{j_1/2} 2^{j_2/2} 2^{(j-m_1)/2r'} 2^{m_2/2} \|g_{j, m_1} \chi_1 \chi_j\|_{L^2} \|\chi_1 \phi_{m_1, j_1}\|_{L^2} \\ &\quad \|w^{\epsilon_0} \hat{v}_{m_2, j_2}\|_{L^2}^{(1-\theta)} \|w^{-\epsilon_0} \partial_{\mu_2} \hat{v}_{m_2, j_2}\|_{L^2}^{\theta}. \end{aligned}$$

We first apply Cauchy-Schwarz with respect to m_2 and we obtain an extra factor $2^{(-m_1+j)/4}$. If we now have that $\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2r'} > \frac{1}{2}$, we can then sum in j , and repeat the argument in Case C2a. This is again the restriction $r' < 2$, which when we go to (2.33) gives $p = 2r > 4$, and hence $\theta > \frac{1}{4}$.

This concludes the proof of Theorem 3. □

Proof of Theorem 4. We first check the part of the statement involving the term $\partial_\tau(\widehat{\partial_x(uv)})$. We proceed by writing

$$\begin{aligned}
& \partial_\tau \left(\xi \int \hat{v}(\xi - \xi_1, \mu - \mu_1, \tau - \tau_1) \hat{u}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1) d\xi_1 d\mu_1 d\tau_1 \right) \\
&= \partial_\tau \left(\xi \int_{|\xi - \xi_1| \leq |\xi_1|} \hat{v}(\xi - \xi_1, \mu - \mu_1, \tau - \tau_1) \hat{u}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1) d\xi_1 d\mu_1 d\tau_1 \right) \\
&+ \partial_\tau \left(\xi \int_{|\xi - \xi_1| \geq |\xi_1|} \hat{v}(\xi - \xi_1, \mu - \mu_1, \tau - \tau_1) \hat{u}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1) d\xi_1 d\mu_1 d\tau_1 \right) \\
&= \xi \int_{|\xi - \xi_1| \leq |\xi_1|} \hat{v}(\xi - \xi_1, \mu - \mu_1, \tau - \tau_1) \partial_{\tau_1} \hat{u}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1) d\xi_1 d\mu_1 d\tau_1 \\
&+ \xi \int_{|\xi - \xi_1| \geq |\xi_1|} \partial_\tau \hat{v}(\xi - \xi_1, \mu - \mu_1, \tau - \tau_1) \hat{u}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1) d\xi_1 d\mu_1 d\tau_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Then the estimates for each one of these two terms follows from the proof of Theorem 3. Next we check the part involving $\partial_\mu \widehat{\partial_x(uv)}$. If we proceed as above, we only need to check

$$I(\xi, \mu, \tau) = \frac{|\xi|}{\max(1, |\xi|, |\mu|/|\xi|)^{\epsilon_0}} \int_{|\xi - \xi_1| \leq |\xi_1|} |\hat{v}(\xi - \xi_1, \mu - \mu_1, \tau - \tau_1)| |\partial_{\mu_1} \hat{u}|(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1) d\xi_1 d\mu_1 d\tau_1.$$

We introduce the two functions

$$(3.62) \quad \phi_{1,j_1}(\xi, \mu, \tau) = \max(1, |\xi|, |\mu|/|\xi|)^{-\epsilon_0} |\partial_\mu \hat{u}| \chi_{j_1}(\xi, \mu, \tau),$$

$$(3.63) \quad \phi_{2,j_2}(\xi, \mu, \tau) = \max(1, |\xi|, |\mu|/|\xi|)^{1-\epsilon_0} |\hat{v}| \chi_{j_2}(\xi, \mu, \tau).$$

corresponding to (3.31) and (3.32) in Theorem 3. We now observe that in the region $|\xi - \xi_1| \leq |\xi_1|$ we also have $\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \leq |\mu - \mu_1|/|\xi - \xi_1| + 2\frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}$, so

$$(3.64) \quad I(\xi, \mu, \tau) \lesssim J^1 + J^2,$$

where

$$(3.65) J^1 = \frac{|\xi|}{\max(1, |\xi|, \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|})^{\epsilon_0}} \int_* \phi_{1,j_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1) \frac{\phi_{2,j_2}}{\max(1, |\xi - \xi_1|, |\mu - \mu_1|/|\xi - \xi_1|)^{1-2\epsilon_0}}$$

$$(3.66) J^2 = |\xi| \int_* \phi_{1,j_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1) \frac{\phi_{2,j_2}}{\max(1, |\xi - \xi_1|, |\mu - \mu_1|/|\xi - \xi_1|)^{1-\epsilon_0}}.$$

where $\int_*$ is the integral over the region given by $|\xi - \xi_1| \leq |\xi_1|$. Also notice that if

$$(3.67) \quad \tilde{J}^2 = |\xi| \int_* \phi_{1,j_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1) \frac{\phi_{2,j_2}}{\max(1, |\xi - \xi_1|, |\mu - \mu_1|/|\xi - \xi_1|)^{1-2\epsilon_0}},$$

then

$$(3.68) \quad J^1 + J^2 \leq \tilde{J}^2.$$

By duality we need to estimate

$$(3.69) \quad \sum_{i=1,2} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{m \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int g_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) J^i(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_m(\xi) \chi_1(\xi, \mu) \chi_j(\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)) d\xi d\mu d\tau$$

$$(3.70) \quad \sum_{i=1,2} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{n \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int g_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) J^i(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_n(\mu) \chi_2(\xi, \mu) \chi_j(\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)) d\xi d\mu d\tau.$$

We begin a case by case analysis for (3.69) and (3.70). We introduce again the notation $\mu = \mu_1 + \mu_2$ and $\xi = \xi_1 + \xi_2$.

Region A_1 . In this region we use (3.68) and we bound (3.69) and (3.70) by replacing $J^i, i = 1, 2$ with $\tilde{J}^2$ in (3.67).

Case A: $|\xi| \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}$.

We only have to estimate (3.69). We observe that $|\xi| \leq 2$ and hence, from (3.67),

$$\tilde{J}^2 \lesssim \int_* \phi_{1,j_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1) \phi_{2,j_2}(\xi - \xi_1, \mu - \mu_1, \tau - \tau_1).$$

Then if we dyadically decompose for $1 + |\xi| \sim 2^m$, the sum in m is a finite sum and we can use Strichartz inequality (2.19), applied to ϕ_{1,j_1} and ϕ_{2,j_2} , and Plancherel and Hölder, to prove the theorem in this case.

Case B: $|\xi| < \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}$.

We have to estimate (3.70). If $\frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|} \leq 1$, it follows that $|\mu_1 + \mu_2| \leq 2$, and we proceed like in Case A. If $\frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|} \geq 1$. We consider two subcases.

Case B1: $|\mu_1| \lesssim |\mu_2|$.

If $\frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|} \leq |\xi_2|$, because $|\xi_2| \leq 1$, it follows that $|\mu_1|, |\mu_2| \leq 4$ and we go back to the previous case. If $\frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|} > |\xi_2|$, we dyadically decompose with respect to μ_2 . Then

$$|\xi_1 + \xi_2| \leq |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{2\epsilon_0} |\mu_1 + \mu_2|^{1-2\epsilon_0} \leq 2 |\mu_1 + \mu_2|^{1-2\epsilon_0}$$

this corresponds to Case B1 of region A_1 in the proof of Theorem 3. In fact we have the following bound for (3.70):

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{n_2 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq r \leq n_2} 2^{-j/2} \int_{A_1} g_j \chi_2 \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_{n_2+1-r} 2^{(n_2+1-r)(1-2\epsilon_0)} \\ & \phi_{1,j_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1) \frac{\chi_2 \phi_{2,j_2,n_2}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2)}{\left(\frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|}\right)^{1-2\epsilon_0}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\phi_{2,j_2,n_2} = \theta_{n_2}(\mu_2) \phi_{2,j_2}$. (Note that $\phi_{1,j_1}, \phi_{2,j_2}$ are in this case as defined in (3.62), (3.63), and one concludes like in that case for $\epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{4}$).

Case B2: $|\mu_1| \gg |\mu_2|$.

Then $|\mu_1| \sim |\mu_1 + \mu_2|$. If $\frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \leq |\xi_1|$, it follows that $|\mu_1 + \mu_2| \sim |\mu_1| \leq 4$. So if we set $1 + |\mu_1 + \mu_2| \sim 2^n$, then the sum on n is finite and we use the Strichartz inequality (2.19). If $\frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} > |\xi_1|$, we dyadically decompose $|\mu_1 + \mu_2| \sim |\mu_1| \sim 2^{n_1}$. Then we use Strichartz inequality (2.19) again.

Region A_2 .

Case A: $|\xi| \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}$.

This case is similar to the corresponding case in Theorem 3. If $|\xi_1| \sim |\xi_2| \sim 2^{m_1}$ and $|\xi_1 + \xi_2| \sim 2^{m_1+1-r}$, $0 \leq r < m_1$, (and $|\xi_1 + \xi_2| \leq 1$ when $r = m_1$), then one can bound (3.69) with

$$\sup_{j,m} \|g_j \chi_1 \chi_j \theta_m\|_{L^2} \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq r \leq m_1} 2^{-r(1-2\epsilon_0)} \Pi_{i=1,2} \sum_{j_i \geq 0} 2^{j_i/2} \|\phi_{i,j_i,m_1}\|_{L^2},$$

and this proves the estimate for $\epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{4}$.

Case B: $|\xi| < \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}$.

If $\frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|} \leq 1$, then $|\xi|, |\mu| \leq 4$ and we go back to the estimate in region A_1 . So we assume that $\frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|} > 1$. We consider two subcases.

Case B1: $|\mu_1| \lesssim |\mu_2|$

If $\frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|} \leq |\xi_2|$ we use the fact that

$$(3.71) \quad |\xi_1 + \xi_2| \leq 1/\sqrt{2} |\mu_1 + \mu_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C |\mu_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C |\xi_2|,$$

and we dyadically decompose with respect to ξ_2 . Then if $|\xi_2| \sim 2^{m_2}$, $1 + |\mu_1 + \mu_2| \sim 2^{-r} 2^{2m_2}$, $0 \leq r \leq 2m_2$. We proceed now like in the corresponding case for Theorem 3 where we replace ϵ_0 by $2\epsilon_0$ and r by $r/2$. If $\frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|} > |\xi_2|$ we dyadically decompose with respect to μ_2 by setting $|\mu_2| \sim 2^{n_2}$. Then $|\mu_1 + \mu_2| \sim 2^{n_2-r+1}$, $0 \leq r \leq n_2$ and from (3.71) also $|\xi_1 + \xi_2| \lesssim 2^{n_2/2-r/2+1/2}$. We reduce our estimate to

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{n_2 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq r \leq n_2} 2^{-j/2} \int_{A_2} g_j \chi_2 \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_{n_2+1-r} 2^{(n_2+1-r)(1-2\epsilon_0)/2} \\ & \times |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{2\epsilon_0} \phi_{1,j_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1) \frac{\chi_2 \phi_{2,j_2,n_2}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2)}{\left(\frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|}\right)^{1-2\epsilon_0}} \\ & \lesssim \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{n_2 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq r \leq n_2} \sum_{j \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int_{A_2} g_j \chi_2 \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_{n_2+1-r} 2^{-r(1-2\epsilon_0)/2} \\ & \times |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{2\epsilon_0} \phi_{1,j_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1) \frac{|\xi_2|^{1-2\epsilon_0}}{|\mu_2|^{(1-2\epsilon_0)/2}} \chi_2 \phi_{2,j_2,n_2}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2) \end{aligned}$$

We use again Lemma 3.1 and, in view of the fact that here $|\xi_2|^2/|\mu_2| \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we continue with

$$\sup_{j,n} \|g_j \chi_2 \chi_j \theta_n\|_{L^2} \sum_{n_2 \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq r \leq n_2} 2^{-r(1-2\epsilon_0)/2} \left(\sum_{j_1 \geq 0} 2^{j_1/2} \|\phi_{1,j_1}\|_{L^2} \right) \left(\sum_{j_2 \geq 0} 2^{j_2/2} \|\chi_2 \phi_{2,n_2,j_2}\|_{L^2} \right),$$

and we sum in r . This is enough to prove the estimate as long as $\epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{4}$.

Case B2: $|\mu_1| \gg |\mu_2|$.

If $\frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \leq |\xi_1|$, then

$$|\xi_1 + \xi_2| \leq 1/\sqrt{2} |\mu_1 + \mu_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C |\mu_1|^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C |\xi_1|,$$

replaces (3.71) and we can repeat the argument given in the first part of Case B1. If $\frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} > |\xi_1|$, since $|\mu_1 + \mu_2| \sim |\mu_1|$, we dyadically decompose with respect to $|\mu_1| \sim 2^{n_1}$.

Because $|\xi_1 + \xi_2| \lesssim |\xi_2|$, we reduce our estimate to

$$(3.72) \quad \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{n_1 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int_{A_2} g_j \chi_2 \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_{n_1} |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{2\epsilon_0} \chi_2 \phi_{1, n_1, j_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1) \phi_{2, j_2}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2),$$

and at this point we can proceed by using Lemma 3.1.

Region $A_3 \cup A_4 \cup (A_5 - \tilde{A}_5(2\epsilon_0))$.

Case A: $\frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|} \leq |\xi|$.

We consider two subcases.

Case A1: $|\xi_1| \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}$.

We dyadically decompose with respect to $|\xi| \sim |\xi_1| \sim 2^{m_1}$. Because in this region $\frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|} \gtrsim |\xi_1| \sim |\xi_1 + \xi_2|$, we reduce our estimate to (3.37) of the corresponding case in the proof of Theorem 3, where ϵ_0 is replaced by $2\epsilon_0$.

Case A2: $|\xi_1| \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}$.

We use again a dyadic decomposition with respect to ξ_1 . Observe that $(|\xi_2| \ll) |\xi_1| \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \leq C \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|}$ hence $\frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|} \sim 2^{m_1+r}$, $r \geq -C_2$. We then reduce our estimate to (3.38), again replacing ϵ_0 with $2\epsilon_0$.

Case B: $\frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|} > |\xi|$. As we observed in the analysis of region $A_i, i = 1, 2$, without loss of generality we can assume that $\frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|} \geq 1$. We consider two subcases.

Case B1: $|\mu_1| \lesssim |\mu_2|$.

We recall that in this region we also have $\frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|} \gg |\xi_2|$ and we repeat the argument presented in the second part of Case B1 of region A_2 .

Case B2: $|\mu_1| \gg |\mu_2|$.

If $\frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \leq |\xi_1|$ then we use an argument similar to the one used in the first part of Case B1 in region A_2 , where the role of (ξ_2, μ_2) is now played by (ξ_1, μ_1) . If $\frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \geq |\xi_1|$, we dyadically decompose so that $|\mu_1 + \mu_2| \sim |\mu_1| \sim 2^{n_1}$. Then because $|\xi_1 + \xi_2| \sim |\xi_1| \lesssim \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|}$, we obtain the estimate (3.72) and also this case is done.

Region $A_5 \cap \tilde{A}_5(2\epsilon_0)$. In this case we cannot use Lemma 3.1.

Case A: $|\xi| \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}$.

We observe that if ⁹ $\epsilon_0 < (\alpha - 1)/2\alpha$, then $(1 + \alpha 2\epsilon_0)(1 - 2\epsilon_0) > 1$ and

$$(3.73) \quad \left(\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \right)^{1-2\epsilon_0} \geq |\xi_1|^{1+\delta} \sim |\xi_1 + \xi_2|^{1+\delta},$$

for some δ such that $0 < \delta \ll 1$. We dyadically decompose so that $|\xi_1| \sim |\xi_1 + \xi_2| \sim 2^{m_1}$ and using (3.73) we reduce the estimate to

$$\sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{m_1 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int g_j \chi_1 \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_{m_1} 2^{-m_1 \delta} \chi_1 \phi_{1, j_1, m_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1) \phi_{2, j_2}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2),$$

and Strichartz inequality (2.19) and Cauchy-Schwarz can be used to finish the proof also in this case.

Case B: $|\xi| \leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}$.

⁹Based on the proof of Lemma 3.1, we assume that $\alpha > 4$ and $2\epsilon_0 < \frac{1}{8}$.

Notice that from (3.42) $|\mu_2| \sim |\xi_2| \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \ll |\mu_1|$, hence $|\mu_1 + \mu_2| \sim |\mu_1|$. We dyadically decompose with respect to $|\mu_1| \sim 2^{n_1}$. Using (3.73) we obtain the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j_1, j_2 \geq 0} \sum_{j \geq 0} \sum_{n_1 \geq 0} 2^{-j/2} \int g_j \chi_2 \chi_j(\xi, \mu, \tau) \theta_{n_1}(\mu) |\xi_1|^{-\delta} \left(\frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \right)^{1-2\epsilon_0} \\ & \times \chi_2 \phi_{1, n_1, j_1}(\xi_1, \mu_1, \tau_1) \frac{\phi_{2, j_2}}{\left(\frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|} \right)^{1-2\epsilon_0}}(\xi_2, \mu_2, \tau_2). \end{aligned}$$

Then Strichartz inequality (2.19) is enough to conclude the proof also in this case.

Region A_6 . As we did for the proof of Theorem 3, also in this case we consider three subcases: **Case A:** $|\xi_1| \geq 10^2 \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}$; **Case B:** $|\xi_1| < 10^{-2} \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}$ and **Case C:** $10^{-2} \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} < |\xi_1| < 10^2 \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|}$. Since in the proof of Theorem 3 we used (3.44) in cases A and B, we can treat these cases in the same way, with the understanding that now ϵ_0 is replaced by $2\epsilon_0$. For Case C we go back to (3.65) and (3.66) and we show that in this region

$$(3.74) \quad J^1 \lesssim J^2.$$

If one assumes this for a moment, then it is easy to see that we can repeat exactly the argument we gave for Case C in the proof of Theorem 3. To prove (3.74) it's enough to show that

$$\max(|\xi|, \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}) \gtrsim \max(1, |\xi_2|, \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|}).$$

To simplify the notation we set $\max(|\xi|, \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}) = M$ and $\max(1, |\xi_2|, \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|}) = M_2$. Assume that $M = |\xi|$. If $M_2 = 1$, then $M_2 = 1 \lesssim |\xi| = M$. If $M_2 = |\xi_2|$, then $M \sim |\xi_1| \gg |\xi_2| = M_2$ and also this case is done. If $M_2 = \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|}$, then $M = |\xi| \sim |\xi_1| \sim \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \gg \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|} = M_2$. Now assume that $M = \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|}$. If $M_2 = 1$, then $M_2 = 1 \lesssim |\xi| \leq \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|} = M$. If $M_2 = |\xi_2|$, then $M_2 \ll |\xi_1| \sim |\xi| \leq \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|} = M_2$ and also this case is done. Finally If $M_2 = \frac{|\mu_2|}{|\xi_2|}$, then $M_2 \ll \frac{|\mu_1|}{|\xi_1|} \sim |\xi_1| \sim |\xi| \leq \frac{|\mu|}{|\xi|} = M$.

The proof of Theorem 4 is now complete. □

We conclude this section with a counterexample that shows that if $\epsilon < \frac{1}{4}$ in Theorem 3, then the theorem does not hold. This counterexample is important because, as we will discuss below in Remark 4.1, if we could have taken $\epsilon < \frac{1}{4}$, then we could have removed the smallness assumption in the initial data and at the same time we would have obtained a global result in the modified energy space $E \cap P$.

Proposition 7. *The bilinear estimate*

$$(3.75) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\partial_x(uv)\|_{X_{1,-\frac{1}{2}}} & \leq C \|u\|_{X_{1,\frac{1}{2}}} (\|v\|_{X_{1,\frac{1}{2}}} + \|v\|_{X_{1,\frac{1}{2}}}^{1-\epsilon} \|v\|_{Y_{1,0,\frac{1}{2}}}^{\epsilon}) \\ & + C \|v\|_{X_{1,\frac{1}{2}}} (\|u\|_{X_{1,\frac{1}{2}}} + \|u\|_{X_{1,\frac{1}{2}}}^{1-\epsilon} \|u\|_{Y_{1,0,\frac{1}{2}}}^{\epsilon}) \end{aligned}$$

fails for $\epsilon < \frac{1}{4}$.

Proof. The proof of the proposition is based on the example of Molinet, Saut and Tzvetkov from [21, 22]. We introduce the sets:

$$E_1 = \{(\xi, \mu, \tau) : \xi \in [\frac{1}{2}\alpha, \alpha], \mu \in [-6\alpha^2, 6\alpha^2], |\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)| \lesssim 1\}$$

$$E_2 = \{(\xi, \mu, \tau) : \xi \in [N, N + \alpha], \mu \in [\sqrt{3}N^2, \sqrt{3}N^2 + \alpha^2], |\tau - \omega(\xi, \mu)| \lesssim 1\}.$$

where again $\omega(\xi, \mu) = \xi^3 + \frac{\mu^2}{\xi}$. We observe that $\partial_\xi \omega(\xi, \mu) = 3\xi^2 - \frac{\mu^2}{\xi^2}$, and $\partial_\mu \omega(\xi, \mu) = \frac{2\mu}{\xi}$. The reason for the $\sqrt{3}$ in the definition of E_2 may be seen by calculating $\partial_\xi \omega$ inside E_2 . The $O(N^2)$ terms cancel and the next biggest term is $O(N\alpha)$. In the region E_2 , the dispersive surface has slope $O(N\alpha)$ along the ξ direction and slope $O(N)$ along μ . An $\alpha \times \alpha^2$ piece of the tangent plane to the dispersive surface in E_2 stays within $N\alpha^2$ of the surface. Therefore, we select $\alpha \sim N^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ so that E_2 is a $O(1)$ vertical thickening of this piece of tangent plane. These calculations then “explain” the choice of the α, α^2 scaling in the ξ and μ directions. Note that E_1 is essentially an $\alpha \times \alpha^2 \times 1$ box.

Let $\hat{u} = \alpha^{-\frac{3}{2}}\chi_{E_1}$, $\hat{v} = N^{-1}\alpha^{-\frac{3}{2}}\chi_{E_2}$, where the functions χ_{E_i} are smoothed out characteristic functions.

We calculate

$$|[\partial_x(uv)]^\sim(\xi, \mu, \tau)| \sim |\xi| |\hat{u} * \hat{v}|(\xi, \mu, \tau) \sim |\xi| \alpha^{-3} N^{-1} \chi_{E_1} * \chi_{E_2}(\xi, \mu, \tau).$$

We have

$$\chi_{E_1} * \chi_{E_2}(\xi, \mu, \tau) \sim \sup_{trans} |trans(E_1) \cap E_2| \chi_{E_1+E_2}(\xi, \mu, \tau),$$

where *trans* denotes an arbitrary translation in the (ξ, μ, τ) space. Geometric considerations similar to those discussed above show that $E_1 + E_2$ contains an $\alpha \times \alpha^2 \times N\alpha^2$ box containing the point $(N + \alpha, \sqrt{3}N^2 + \alpha^2, 4N^3)$. This point is at vertical distance $O(1)$ from the dispersive surface. Since E_2 has slope $N\alpha$ along ξ and slope N along μ , we observe that the sup above is bounded by $(N\alpha)^{-1} \times N^{-1} \times 1$. Combining these remarks gives,

$$|\widehat{\partial_x uv}| \sim N \alpha^{-3} N^{-1} N^{-2} \alpha^{-1} \chi_{E_1+E_2} \sim \alpha^{-4} N^{-2} \chi_{E_1+E_2}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\|\partial_x(uv)\|_{X_{1,-\frac{1}{2}}} \gtrsim \alpha^{-4} N^{-2} N(N\alpha^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} |E_1 + E_2|^{\frac{1}{2}} \gtrsim \alpha^{-5} N^{-1-\frac{1}{2}} (\alpha^5 N)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The choice of $\alpha = N^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ yields

$$\|\partial_x(uv)\|_{X_{1,-\frac{1}{2}}} \gtrsim N^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

as the size of the left-side of (3.75).

We now consider the right-side of (3.75). The functions u, v are normalized to have size $O(1)$ in the various $X_{s,b}$ -norms. The $Y_{1,0,\frac{1}{2}}$ -norm has two pieces. The term arising from $\partial_\tau u$ essentially reproduces u since E_1 is of size $O(1)$ along the τ direction. The other term involves $\partial_\mu u$. Since E_1 has size α^2 along μ , we have that $|\partial_\mu \chi_{E_1}| \sim \alpha^{-2} \chi_{E_1}$ so this part of the $Y_{1,0,\frac{1}{2}}$ -norm is of size $O(\alpha^{-2}) = O(N)$. Upon taking this to the power ϵ and comparing with the size of the left-side, $N^{\frac{1}{4}}$, we see the failure of (3.75) when $\epsilon < \frac{1}{4}$. $\square$

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1 AND THEOREM 2

We start with the proof of Theorem 2, because Theorem 1 is a corollary of Theorem 2. The proof uses a classical fixed point theorem (see for example [16]). We will first carry out the proof when $T = \frac{1}{2}$

Proof of Theorem 2. We start by transforming (1.1) into the integral equation

$$(4.1) \quad u = \psi(t)S(t)u_0 - \psi(t) \int_0^t S(t-t')\partial_x(u^2)(t')dt'.$$

(Here we have fixed $\beta = 1$.) Then it is clear that a solution for (4.1) is a fixed point for the operator

$$(4.2) \quad L(v) = \psi(t)S(t)u_0 - \psi(t) \int_0^t S(t-t')\partial_x(v^2)(t')dt'$$

To simplify the notation we set $Z_{1-\epsilon_0} = X_{1-\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}} \cap Y_{1-\epsilon_0, -\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}$. Then, for fixed $\sigma > 0$, we assume that $\|u_0\|_{B_{1-\epsilon_0}^{1,2} \cap P_{-\epsilon_0}^{1,2}} \leq \sigma$ and we set $a = 4C\|u_0\|_{B_{1-\epsilon_0}^{1,2} \cap P_{-\epsilon_0}^{1,2}}$, where C is the constant in (2.2) and (2.3). We show that, if B_a is the ball centered at the origin and radius a in $Z_{1-\epsilon_0}$, then

$$(4.3) \quad L : B_a \longrightarrow B_a,$$

$$(4.4) \quad \|L(u-v)\|_{Z_{1-\epsilon_0}} \leq \frac{1}{2}\|u-v\|_{Z_{1-\epsilon_0}}$$

and this is enough to finish the proof of the theorem. To prove (4.3) we use (2.2), (2.3), (2.11) and (2.12) to show that

$$\|L(v)\|_{Z_{1-\epsilon_0}} \lesssim \frac{a}{4} + C_1(\|\partial_x(v^2)\|_{X_{1-\epsilon_0, -\frac{1}{2}}} + \|\partial_x(v^2)\|_{Y_{1-\epsilon_0, -\epsilon_0, -\frac{1}{2}}})$$

and if we continue with Theorems 3 and 4 we obtain

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \|L(v)\|_{Z_{1-\epsilon_0}} &\lesssim \frac{a}{4} \\ &+ C_1(\|v\|_{X_{1-\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}}^2 + \|v\|_{X_{1-\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}} \|v\|_{Y_{1-\epsilon_0, -\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}} + \|v\|_{X_{1-\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}}^{1-\epsilon} \|v\|_{Y_{1-\epsilon_0, -\epsilon_0, \frac{1}{2}}}^{1+\epsilon}), \end{aligned}$$

hence (4.3) follows with our choice of a , for small σ . $\square$

We finish this section with a remark that should convince the reader that in a sense the fixed point method used above is performed in a critical regime. This criticality appears in an unusual way. This remark also shows how to obtain the case of general T in Theorem 2, from the case $T = \frac{1}{2}$. One simply chooses $T = \lambda^3/2$ below, λ large, and then the norm small depending also on λ .

Remark 4.1. If $u(x, y, t)$ is a solution of the IVP (1.1), then

$$(4.6) \quad u_\lambda(x, y, t) = \lambda^2 u(\lambda x, \lambda^2 y, \lambda^3 t)$$

is a solution for the IVP (1.1) with initial data $u_{\lambda,0}(x, y) = \lambda^2 u_0(\lambda x, \lambda^2 y)$. Following the directions in the literature we define the *critical Sobolev indices for the KP equation* as the couple of real numbers (s_c^1, s_c^2) such that the homogeneous Sobolev norm

$$\|u_{\lambda,0}(x, y)\|_{\dot{H}_{x,y}^{s_c^1, s_c^2}} \sim C,$$

where C is independent of λ . With a simple calculation we obtain

$$(4.7) \quad s_c^1 + 2s_c^2 = -\frac{1}{2}.$$

While for the KP-II equation one can get a well-posedness theory for Sobolev spaces with indices satisfying a relationship pretty close to (4.7) (see [27]), for the KP-I, due to the observations made in the introduction, we do not really expect to be able to reach near the critical indices in (4.7). The type of criticality that occurs in our case can be summarized in the following lemma:

Lemma 4.1. *In u_λ is defined as in (4.6), $0 < \lambda \leq 1$, then for any $s \geq 1$,*

$$(4.8) \quad \|u_{0,\lambda}\|_{B_s^{2,1}}^{1-\epsilon} \|u_{0,\lambda}\|_{P_{s-1}^{2,1}}^\epsilon \lesssim \lambda^{1-4\epsilon}.$$

The proof of the lemma follows from simple changes of variables.

Observe that we can consider $\epsilon = \frac{1}{4}$ to be a critical exponent in this case. In fact, if we could take $\epsilon < \frac{1}{4}$ in Theorems 3 and 4, then we could use (4.8) to remove the smallness assumption needed in the contraction argument presented for the proof of Theorem 2. But, like the counterexample in Proposition 7 shows, this is not possible.

We are now ready to sketch the proof of Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. Let's fix an interval of time $[-T, T]$ and a small $\epsilon > 0$ ($\epsilon < \frac{1}{16}$). In light of Remark 1.3, we have that, if $u_0 \in E \cap P$, and $\|u_0\|_{E \cap P} \leq \delta_1$, then $u_0 \in B_{1-\epsilon}^{2,1} \cap P_{-\epsilon}^{2,1}$, and we can choose $\delta_1 = \delta_1(\epsilon)$ so that $\|u_0\|_{B_{1-\epsilon}^{2,1} \cap P_{-\epsilon}^{2,1}} \leq \delta$ where δ is chosen as in Theorem 2, depending upon ϵ, δ_1 . We can thus apply Theorem 2 to obtain a unique solution $u \in Z_{1-\epsilon} = X_{1-\epsilon, \frac{1}{2}} \cap Y_{1-\epsilon, -\epsilon, \frac{1}{2}}$. Now, by continuity with respect to the initial data, if u_0^k is a smooth sequence that approximates u_0 in $B_{\delta_1} \subset E \cap P$, which also approximates it in $B_{1-\epsilon}^{2,1} \cap P_{-\epsilon}^{2,1}$, then the associated sequence of solutions u_k is smooth, and it approximates u in $C([-T, T]; B_{1-\epsilon}^{2,1} \cap P_{-\epsilon}^{2,1})$. On the other hand, by Remark 1.1,

$$\|u_k\|_{L_{[-T, T]}^\infty(E \cap P)} \leq C(T, \|u_0\|_{E \cap P}),$$

uniformly with respect to k . Thus, u_k has a weak limit in $L_{[-T, T]}^\infty(E \cap P)$ that must coincide with u for almost every t . Then,

$$\|u\|_{L_{[-T, T]}^\infty(E \cap P)} \leq C(T, \|u_0\|_{E \cap P}),$$

and this concludes the proof. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Ben-Artzi, J.-C. Saut, *Uniform decay estimates for a class of oscillatory integrals and applications*, Diff. Int. Eq. **12** (1999), 137–145.
- [2] J. Bergh, J. Löfström, *Interpolation Spaces*, Springer-Verlag, (1976).
- [3] J. Bourgain, *On the Cauchy problem for the Kadomtsev-Petviashvili equation*, Geometric and Funct. Anal. **3** (1993), 315–341.
- [4] J. Colliander, *Globalizing estimates for the periodic KPI equation*, Illinois J. Math. **40** (1996), no. 4, 692–698.
- [5] J. Colliander, C. Kenig, G. Staffilani, *Small solutions for the Kadomtsev-Petviashvili I equation*, Mosc. Math. J. **1** (2001), no. 4, 491–520.

- [6] A. V. Faminskii, *Cauchy problem for the generalized Kadomtsev- Petviashvili equation*, Sibirsk. Mat. Zh. **33** (1992), 160–172.
- [7] A. S. Fokas, L. Y. Sung, *On the solvability of the N-wave, Davey-Stewartson and Kadomtsev- Petviashvili equations*, Inverse Problems **8** (1992), 673–708.
- [8] J. Ginibre, Y. Tsutsumi, G. Velo, *On the Cauchy problem for the Zakharov system*, J. Funct. Anal. **151** (1997), no. 2, 384–436.
- [9] R. J. Íorio, W. V. L. Nunes, *On equations of KP-type*, Proc. Royal Soc. Edin. **128A** (1998), 725–743.
- [10] P. J. Isaza, J. L. Mejía, V. Stallbohm, *Local solutions for the Kadomtsev- Petviashvili equation in $\mathbb{R}^2$* , J. Math. Anal. Appl. **196** (1995), 566–587.
- [11] P. J. Isaza, J. L. Mejía, V. Stallbohm, *Regularizing effects for the linearized Kadomtsev-Petviashvili (KP) equation*, Rev. Colombiana Mat. **31** (1997), 37–61.
- [12] B. B. Kadomtsev, V. I. Petviashvili, *On the stability of solitary waves in weakly dispersive media*, Soviet Phys. Dokl. **15** (1970), 539–541.
- [13] C. Kenig, G. Ponce, L. Vega, *The Cauchy problem for the Korteweg-de Vries equation in Sobolev spaces of negative indices*, Duke Math. J. **71**, No.1, (1993), 1–21.
- [14] C.E. Kenig, G. Ponce, L. Vega, *Oscillatory integrals and regularity of dispersive equations*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **40** (1991), 33–69.
- [15] C.E. Kenig, G. Ponce, L. Vega, *Well-posedness and scattering results for generalized Korteweg-de Vries equation via the contraction principle*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **46** (1993), 527–620.
- [16] C.E. Kenig, G. Ponce, L. Vega, *The Cauchy problem for the Korteweg-de Vries equation in Sobolev spaces of negative indices*, Duke Math. J. **71** (1993), no. 1, 1–21.
- [17] C.E. Kenig, G. Ponce, L. Vega, *Small solutions to nonlinear Schrödinger equations*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire, **10** (1993), 255–288.
- [18] C.E. Kenig, G. Ponce, L. Vega, *A bilinear estimate with applications to KdV equations*, J. AMS, **9** (1996), 573–603.
- [19] L. Molinet, F. Ribaud, *The global Cauchy problem in Bourgain’s type spaces for a dispersive dissipative semilinear equation*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **33** (2002), no. 6, 1269–1296.
- [20] L. Molinet, F. Ribaud, *On the low regularity of the Korteweg-de Vries-Burgers equation*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **2002**, no. 37, 1979–2005.
- [21] L. Molinet, J.-C. Saut, N. Tzvetkov, *Well-posedness and ill-posedness results for the Kadomtsev- Petviashvili-I equation*, Duke. Math. J. **115** (2002), no. 2, 353–384.
- [22] L. Molinet, J.-C. Saut, N. Tzvetkov, *Global well-posedness for the KP-I equation*, Math. Ann. **324** (2002), no. 2, 255–275.
- [23] J.-C. Saut, *Remarks on generalized Kadomtsev-Petviashvili equations*, Indiana Math. J. **42**, No. 3 (1993), 1011–1026.
- [24] J.-C. Saut, N. Tzvetkov, *The Cauchy problem for higher-order KP equations*, J. Differential Equations, **153** (1999), no. 1, 196–222.
- [25] M. Schwarz, *Periodic solutions of Kadomtsev- Petviashvili equations*, Adv. Math. **66** (1987), 217–233.
- [26] H. Takaoka, *Time local well-posedness for the Kadomtsev-Petviashvili II equation*, Harmonic Analysis and nonlinear PDE **1102** (1999), 1–8.
- [27] H. Takaoka and N. Tzvetkov, *On the local regularity of Kadomtsev-Petviashvili II equation*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices **2** (2001), 77–114.
- [28] M. M. Tom, *On the generalized Kadomtsev- Petviashvili equation*, Contemp. Math. AMS **200** (1996), 193–210.
- [29] S. Ukai, *Local solutions of the Kadomtsev- Petviashvili equation*, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. 1A Math. **36** (1989), 193–209.
- [30] X. Zhou, *Inverse scattering transform for the time dependent Schrödinger equations with application to the KP-I equations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **128** (1990), 551–564.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY